

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/01/12 : CIA-RDP65-00756R000300040001-4

102
CONFIDENTIAL

FBI REVIEW COMPLETED

COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES AND TACTICS CONCERNING NATIONAL LIBERATION AND COLONIAL MOVEMENTS



FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
John Edgar Hoover, Director

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/01/12 : CIA-RDP65-00756R000300040001-4

- CONFIDENTIAL

25X1

[REDACTED] CONFIDENTIAL

COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES AND TACTICS CONCERNING
NATIONAL LIBERATION AND
COLONIAL MOVEMENTS

November, 1952

United States Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Investigation
John Edgar Hoover, Director

25X1

[REDACTED] CONFIDENTIAL

52 - S . 69

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
Preface - - - - -	i-ii
Introduction- - - - -	1-3
I. BASIC COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES CONCERNING LIBERATION AND COLONIAL MOVEMENTS - - - - -	4-38
National Oppression and the Class Struggle - - - - -	4
Communist Definition of Nation and State - - - - -	5
Origin of the Nation - - - - -	6
National Oppression as a Product of Capitalism - - - - -	8
Working-Class Solidarity vs. Nationalism - - - - -	9
The Class Struggle Is Compromised - - - - -	11
The "National Question" Is Expanded - - - - -	12
Liberation and Colonial Movements as Part of the Revolution - - - - -	14
National Liberation the "First Phase" of Socialist Revolution - - - - -	16
'Revolutionizing the Colonial Reserves" - - - - -	20
Flexibility of Communist Theory - - - - -	22
Self-Determination of Nations - - - - -	25
Self-Determination Becomes "Reactionary" - - - - -	27
Self-Determination Is Abandoned - - - - -	30
"Right of Secession" Replaces Self-Determination - - - - -	33
"Right of Secession" In Soviet Union - - - - -	35
Conclusions - - - - -	37
II. APPLICATION OF COMMUNIST THEORY TO NATIONAL AND COLONIAL PROBLEMS AFFECTING THE UNITED STATES - - - - -	39-78
U.S. as an Imperialist Power and National Oppressor - - - - -	39
Methods of U.S. Imperialism - - - - -	40
Good-Neighbor Policy - - - - -	43
Pan-Americanism - - - - -	43
Monroe Doctrine - - - - -	44
Open Door Policy for China - - - - -	44
Point Four Program - - - - -	44
Extent and Aims of U.S. Colonial Empire - - - - -	48
Communist Propaganda Concerning Puerto Rico - - - - -	54
Communist Propaganda Concerning the Philippines - - - - -	61
CONCLUSIONS - - - - -	78-81
SOURCES - - - - -	82-89

PREFACE

The purpose of this study is to briefly examine Communist Party principles and practice with respect to national liberation and colonial independence movements, with particular emphasis on those national and colonial problems affecting the United States. This paper is broken down into two main parts:

1. Basic Communist principles concerning liberation and colonial movements;
2. Application of Communist theory to national and colonial problems relating to the United States.

It is the intention of this study not merely to furnish a factual description of Communist doctrine and policy in this field, but also to relate Communist theory to changing historical conditions, to trace the development of this theory, to point out its objectives, and to suggest its weaknesses.

In some respects this paper, particularly the first section, will represent more of a critique of Marxist theory on this subject than merely a literal description of such theory. It is hoped in this manner not only to acquaint investigative personnel with the major features of Communist doctrine and propaganda concerning the national and colonial questions, but also to enable the reader to tie in specific Communist Party policies with the over-all Marxist program as well as with historical conditions.

No effort has been made to examine the extravagant Communist claims relating to the "complete" and "brilliant" solution of the problems of national oppression in the Soviet Union, although the tireless Communist propaganda on this score has no doubt converted some of the more gullible members of national minority groups to the Marxist cause. Furthermore, it has been the aim of this limited study to bypass the vast "dialectical" smoke screen with which the Communists have surrounded this issue and, instead, to isolate the crucial statements in Marxist literature which offer clues to a real understanding of the Communist position.

However, it will be noted that in every case the conclusions reached in this study are substantiated and documented from authoritative Communist sources.

INTRODUCTION

A study of Communist principles concerning the national liberation and colonial independence movements is especially appropriate at this time in view of the current state of world affairs. Both the Communist and the non-Communist will probably agree that the world today is divided into two powerful and hostile camps: the camp of socialism headed by the Soviet Union and including the Soviet satellite countries of Eastern Europe and China; and the camp of capitalism led by the United States and including the democratic nations of Western Europe and North America. According to authoritative sources, the "socialist" camp today exercises direct control over approximately 850 million people, whereas the so-called "capitalist" camp has clear-cut control of some 550 million people.

In between these two belligerent forces, however, there lies a great body of temporarily "neutral" peoples who have not as yet definitely committed themselves to either socialism or capitalism, namely, the approximate one billion peoples comprising the colonial, semicolonial and undeveloped areas of the world. Among this vast number of "neutrals" are such key regions as India, the countries of the Near and Middle East, South America, and virtually all of the nations of Africa and the Far East (other than China).

25X1

CONFIDENTIAL

It is obvious that the final victory of either socialism or capitalism will depend to a large degree on the ability of each system to enlist the active support of these present "non-belligerents," not only because of their tremendous reserves of manpower, but also because control of these regions involves a crucial share of vitally needed raw materials, foodstuffs, military bases, etc.

The fact that the Western democracies are keenly aware of the decisive nature of this contest to win the support of the vast body of colonial and dependent nations can be seen in a number of ways. The International Development Program ("Point Four") of the United States, the establishment of many foundations and agencies to extend scientific and material assistance to backward countries, the granting of independence to many former colonies of the United States and Great Britain, all these are important steps in the Western world's effort to strengthen its ranks among the "neutral" nations.

The Communists, likewise, clearly recognize the crucial importance of this issue. Although they have not been able to offer the colonial world the same economic and material aid as that furnished by the Western democracies, they have flooded the airwaves and printing presses of the world with a steady stream of propaganda which aims to convince the various national minority groups (e.g., the American Negro) and the colonial or semicolonial independence movements (e.g., Puerto Rican patriot) that the "national oppression" they suffer is part and parcel of the capitalist system and that the only solution for their problems lies in the overthrow of capitalism and an alliance with the "dictatorship of the proletariat" (i.e., Soviet Russia).

With these considerations in mind, the importance of understanding Communist theory and practice with respect to the national liberation and colonial movements becomes apparent. For only by recognizing the peculiar "logic" of Marxist principles in this field can we effectively oppose Communist propaganda and expose its fallacies.

PART I

BASIC COMMUNIST PRINCIPLES CONCERNING LIBERATION AND COLONIAL MOVEMENTS

NATIONAL OPPRESSION AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE

The crux of Communist doctrine is the idea that the class struggle is the motive force in history, and that the character of nearly all human institutions as well as most social problems can therefore be seen as symptoms or reflections of the conflict between classes, between the ruling class and the subject class, the oppressing class and the oppressed class, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. According to the Communist creed, the only lasting solution to all of mankind's problems, social and economic alike, lies in the abolition of classes under a "dictatorship of the proletariat" leading to the formation of a completely classless society.

The problem of national oppression, the persecution of national minority groups and the enslavement of colonial peoples, is viewed by the Communist as symptoms of the class struggle during a particular historical period, the era of capitalism. National oppression, the Marxist believes, is only a special form employed by the dominant class of the capitalist epoch (the bourgeoisie) to exploit its rival class (the proletariat) under the historical conditions of capitalism.

COMMUNIST DEFINITION OF NATION AND STATE

To avoid confusion, an approach to Communist theory in this field must begin with the Marxist definition of "nation." Joseph Stalin provided the most widely accepted Communist definition of the nation in 1913 when he declared that a nation was "a historically evolved, stable community of people" with four necessary characteristics:

1. a common language
2. a common territory
3. a common economic life or "economic cohesion"
4. a common psychological make-up or "national character"

manifested in a community of culture. 1

It can be seen that this definition is sufficiently broad to include not only such clearly defined nations as Ireland and Finland, but also such hazy and poorly defined "nations" as the American Negro, at least in the so-called "Black Belt" of the South where a "common territory" can be claimed.

It is important to distinguish here between the Communist concepts of "state" and "nation." According to Marxist doctrine, the state (with the exception of the dictatorship of the proletariat) is a political unit and is essentially an instrument used by the ruling class to oppress the subject class. In the words of The Communist Manifesto, the state is the "executive committee" 2 of the bourgeoisie. Consequently the state in Communist theory is bitterly denounced as an enemy of the working class; and one finds no

discussion of the "rights of states" or the oppression of one state by another state.

On the other hand, the nation in Communist doctrine is a social, territorial, and economic unit, which may or may not coincide with the geographical limits of the state in any given case. The nation is not seen as an instrument of ruling class oppression and, therefore, the Communist propagandist can devote considerable attention to the "rights of nations" and to the problem of national oppression.

ORIGIN OF THE NATION

Although Communists look upon the nation as a gradually developing historical form with its origins in the dim past, they nevertheless assert that the establishment of full-fledged nations (i. e., meeting all the prerequisites in Stalin's definition) only took place with the advent of capitalism. Stalin himself declared:

"... there were no nations in the pre-capitalist period." 3

It is argued that the formation of nations was promoted by the bourgeoisie in the early stages of capitalism in order to facilitate the expansion of capitalist productive forces and to centralize bourgeois economic and legal power for the coming struggle between rival factions of the bourgeoisie. In Marxist terms, the development of nations signalized a change in the productive relations of society (or "super-structure") which resulted from a change in the mode of production (or "substructure").

Thus, the nation is regarded as being primarily a bourgeois institution. This idea is expressed in the first public statement of Communist principles, The Communist Manifesto:

"More and more the bourgeoisie keeps doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralisation. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class interest, one frontier and one customs tariff." 4

Stalin indicates his approval of this thesis in the following passages:

"A nation is not merely a historical category but a historical category belonging to a definite epoch, the epoch of rising capitalism. The process of elimination of feudalism and development of capitalism was at the same time a process of amalgamation of people into nations. Such, for instance, was the case in Western Europe. The British, French, Germans, Italians and others formed themselves into nations at the time of the victorious advance of capitalism and its triumph over feudal disunity." 5

"From what has been said it will be clear that the national struggle under the conditions of rising capitalism is a struggle of the bourgeois classes among themselves. Sometimes the bourgeoisie succeeds in drawing the proletariat into the national movement, and then the national struggle externally assumes a 'nation-wide' character. But this is so only externally. In its essence it is always a bourgeois struggle, one that is chiefly favourable to and suitable for the bourgeoisie." 6 (Words under-scored are italicized in original text - ed.)

"The fate of the national movement, which is essentially a bourgeois movement, is naturally connected with the fate of the bourgeoisie."⁷

NATIONAL OPPRESSION AS A PRODUCT OF CAPITALISM

From the premise that national movements and the establishment of nations are sponsored by the bourgeoisie for economic reasons, Communists conclude that national oppression results from the bitter rivalry between various factions of the bourgeoisie. National oppression is seen as being caused by the "irreconcilable" economic strife promoted by the capitalist system. Stalin characterized national oppression as follows:

"....that system of exploitation and plunder of subject peoples, those measures of forcible restriction of the political rights of subject peoples, which are resorted to by imperialist (i.e., capitalist - ed.) circles."⁸

Communists, therefore, fix the ultimate blame for national oppression on the capitalist system itself rather than on any geographical or historical circumstances, human nature, or other noncapitalist factors:

"...private property and capital inevitably disunite people, inflame national enmity and intensify national oppression..."⁹

"The existence of capitalism without national oppression is... inconceivable."¹⁰

Following this line of argument, Communists declare that national problems and national oppression are, in the last analysis, the product of economic exploitation under the capitalist system and that they represent, in fact, only one aspect of the class struggle in the capitalist era. It is concluded

that national oppression will vanish with the overthrow of capitalism and the creation of a classless (i.e., Communist) society. In the words of The Communist Manifesto:

"In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end."¹¹

With this brief background, it is now proper to examine in more detail the Marxist attitude towards national liberation and colonial independence movements - or, in Communist phraseology, towards the "national question."

WORKING-CLASS SOLIDARITY VS. NATIONALISM

One of the most difficult problems facing the Marxist theorist in dealing with the "national question" has been the effort to reconcile an apparent contradiction between Marx's view of nations as primarily a bourgeois institution and the necessity of portraying Communism as the defender of downtrodden and oppressed nations. In other words, if the Communist sees history as a class struggle and if he consistently urges that the worker's first loyalty should be to his class as opposed to his nation, how can he profess to champion the purely national aspirations of liberation movements in the colonies and dependent nations?

The attempt to resolve this seeming paradox has, in fact, strained the flexibility of Marxist dialectics nearly to the breaking point.

As we have seen, the Communists are plainly on record as believing that nations originate and develop during the early stages of capitalism as a result of the bourgeoisie's need for economic and political centralization; that national movements are, therefore, essentially bourgeois in character; and that "the fate of the national movement... is naturally connected with the fate of the bourgeoisie."¹²

The Communist Manifesto bluntly declares that "workingmen have no country," inferring that they, therefore, owe no loyalty to any nation.¹³ In fact, the student of Marxist literature will not have to look far to find a number of critical remarks concerning attachment to nation or patriotism; or, in Communist terminology, "bourgeois nationalism," "nationalistic chauvinism," "nationalist deviation," and "nationalistic imperialism."

The very word "nationalism" is frequently placed in quotes by Communist writers so that there may be no misunderstanding on the reader's part, a device often employed to label an idea as dangerous or "counter-revolutionary."

But despite the evidence that Communists care little for the intrinsic rights of nations or for the success of any national independence movement per se, they have still recognized the need to enlist the support of various national and colonial movements in the struggle against capitalism. For this reason, Communist writers have faithfully labored to construct a

theory which would prove that the interests of the world-wide proletarian (class) struggle were dependent on and connected with every liberation or colonial (national) struggle and vice versa. It was inevitable, of course, that along the way the Communists would have to make many concessions to the hated idea of "nationalism," at the expense of their concept of working-class solidarity or "proletarian internationalism."

THE CLASS STRUGGLE IS COMPROMISED

The Communist attempt to compromise the theory of the class struggle, in order to allow leeway for the encouragement of purely national movements whenever the practical need might arise, began with the recognition that nations are a historical fact, and that, therefore, the class struggle would often outwardly assume a national form. Even The Communist Manifesto, with all its stress on the class struggle as the primary force in history, conceded this fact although with an appropriate caution:

"Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word."¹⁴

"Though not in substance, yet in form, the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle."¹⁵ (Underscored word is italicized in original text - ed.)

Lenin, who had a knack of adapting theory to the practical needs of revolution, repeated this idea in slightly expanded form:

"Nations are an inevitable product, an inevitable form in the bourgeois epoch of social development. The working class could not grow strong, could not become mature and formed without 'constituting itself within the nation,' without being 'national' (though not in the bourgeois sense of the word)." 16

Stalin, who is hailed by Communists as the final authority on the national question, extended the concession to nationalism, even agreeing that the interests of the proletariat in the class struggle occasionally coincided with the interests of the bourgeoisie in the national struggle:

"Sometimes the bourgeoisie succeeds in drawing the proletariat into the national movement, and then the national struggle externally assumes a 'nation-wide' character. But this is so only externally. In its essence it is always a bourgeois struggle....

"But it does not follow from this that the proletariat should not put up a fight against the policy of national oppression" (i. e., should not cooperate with the bourgeoisie of its own nation in the national movement directed against the bourgeoisie of a rival nation - ed.). 17

"The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation... is naturally stirred into movement. It appeals to its 'native folk' and begins to cry out about the 'fatherland,' claiming that its own cause is the cause of the nation as a whole.... Nor do the 'folk' (i. e., proletariat and peasantry - ed.) always remain unresponsive to its appeals, they rally around its banner: the repression from above affects them also and provokes their discontent." 18

THE 'NATIONAL QUESTION' IS EXPANDED

By such reasoning, Communist theorists laid the groundwork for a compromise between nationalism and revolutionary internationalism. But

these concessions to nationalism were minor and granted only begrudgingly. It may be noted that the foregoing statements were made prior to the success of the Russian Revolution in 1917 and the establishment of a definite base of Communist operations (i.e., Soviet Russia).

With the victory of Bolshevism in Russia and the ensuing all-out struggle between world capitalism and Communism, Soviet leaders promptly appreciated the need to enlarge their theories concerning nationalism in order to capitalize on the ever-increasing independence movements in the colonial and semicolonial nations. It was important to expand the "national question" from merely a theoretical discussion of the development and rights of nations into a world-wide revolutionary slogan which would exploit the liberation struggles of the "backward" or non capitalist peoples of China, Egypt, India, Latin America and elsewhere.

As early as 1918 Stalin foresaw this need and tried to establish a connection between the national liberation movements and the world-wide proletarian revolution:

"Having triumphed in the centre of Russia and spread to a number of the border regions, the October Revolution could not stop short at the territorial frontiers of Russia... Russia's break with imperialism... and the militant battle-cry for a determined struggle against imperialism issued to the world by the Soviet government... could not but greatly affect the enslaved East and the bleeding West... The important thing is not that the struggle in the East and even in the West has not yet succeeded in shedding its bourgeois-nationalist superstrata; the important thing

is that the struggle against imperialism (i.e., world capitalism - ed.) has begun.... In this way the October Revolution is establishing a tie between the nations of the backward East and of the advanced West and is drawing them into a common struggle against imperialism."¹⁹

Based on these arguments, Stalin proclaimed that the successful Bolshevik revolution had:

"...widened the scope of the national question and converted it from the particular question of combating national oppression into the general question of emancipating the oppressed nations, colonies and semi-colonies from imperialism...." and,

"...greatly helped the cause of emancipation of the oppressed nations of the West and the East, having drawn them into the common channel of the victorious struggle against imperialism."²⁰

LIBERATION AND COLONIAL MOVEMENTS AS PART OF THE REVOLUTION

By 1923 Stalin had developed the "organic connection"²¹ between the national and colonial independence movements and the world-wide proletarian revolution to the point where he essayed to "prove" that colonial and national oppression was inevitable under capitalism and could only be solved by the overthrow of the capitalist system and the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. Stalin offered the following arguments to support this claim:

1. Capitalist Development Automatically Leads to National Oppression.

"...The subsequent growth of capitalism in Europe, the need for new markets, the search for raw materials and fuel, and, finally, the development of imperialism, the export of capital and the necessity of protecting the great sea and rail routes, have led... to the seizure of new territories by the old national states...(and subjugation) of new (weak) nationalities at the expense of neighboring states."²²

2. Capitalist Attempts to Solve Problem Cannot Succeed.

"The imperialist war (World War I)... led to an extreme aggravation of national conflicts within the victorious colonial states (Great Britain, France, Italy), to the complete disintegration of the defeated former multi-national states (Austria, Hungary, Russia in 1917) and, finally - as the most 'radical' solution of the national problem of which the bourgeoisie is capable - to the formation of new bourgeois national states (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, etc.). But the formation of new independent national states... did not eliminate, and could not eliminate, either national inequality or national oppression; for the new national states, based as they are on private property and class inequality, cannot exist without: oppressing their own national minorities... without extending their territories at the expense of their neighbours, which leads to conflict and war... and without becoming subject financially, economically and militarily to the 'Great' imperialist powers."²³

3. National Oppression Is Inherent in Capitalist System.

Thus, postwar capitalist society "presents a gloomy picture of national enmity, oppression, conflict, war and imperialist brutality on the part of the nations of civilized countries both towards each other and towards the non-sovereign peoples." The irreconcilable contradictions inherent in the capitalist system are seen as follows:

"...on the one hand we have a few 'Great' Powers, which oppress and exploit the mass of dependent... national states and the struggle of these powers among themselves for the monopoly of exploiting the national states; and on the other hand we have the struggle of the dependent national states against the intolerable oppression of the 'Great' Powers; the struggle of the national states among themselves for the extension of their national territory; the struggle of the national states, each in particular, against its own oppressed national minorities; and, finally, the growth of the movement for emancipation on the part of the colonies against the 'Great' Powers."²⁴

It is concluded that "bourgeois society has proved to be utterly bankrupt in the matter of solving the national problem." 25

4. Socialism, by Contrast, Does Away With National Oppression.

"Whereas private property and capital inevitably disunite people, inflame national enmity and intensify national oppression, collective property and labour just as inevitably bring people closer and undermine national oppression. The existence of capitalism without national oppression is just as inconceivable as the existence of socialism without the emancipation of oppressed nations, without national freedom... national peace and national freedom may be regarded as assured when the peasantry follows the proletariat, that is to say, when the dictatorship of the proletariat has been secured." 26

In summary, Communists have appealed to the national liberation and colonial movements throughout the world to join the revolutionary forces of Marxism on the basis of creating a united front against a common enemy, i. e., the capitalist, imperialist system which fosters national oppression and colonial bondage.

NATIONAL LIBERATION THE "FIRST PHASE" OF SOCIALIST REVOLUTION

Having established a connection between the national liberation and colonial movements and the proletarian revolution, some of the more adept Marxist dialecticians have tried to carry the argument one step further, i. e., to show that the various independence movements actually constitute a preliminary phase of the proletarian revolution, that they represent a necessary step in the socialist program to overthrow capitalism.

The strategy of the Communist Party consists of supporting this "preliminary" stage of the full-fledged socialist revolution, while at the same time attempting to manage the liberation movement in such a way as to pave the way for an immediate transition to the "second phase"--the "fully developed" proletarian revolution. In Marxist terms, this might be described as capitalizing on the "anti-imperialist factors" inherent in the independence movements, while emphasizing their "revolutionary aspects."

In actual practice Communists employ an ever-shifting policy in stressing the dual objective of the independence struggle: at one moment picturing the final goal of such movements as national independence for its own sake; and at the next moment emphasizing the need to "convert" these movements into an all-out attack on the entire capitalist-feudalist system and viewing national independence as merely a means to this end.

The extent to which Communists focus attention on the "revolutionary aspects" of any particular liberation movement depends chiefly on two factors:

1. the over-all strategy of World Communism (or Soviet Russia) at that time;
2. the practical chances for succeeding in an all-out attack on the capitalist or feudalist regime in the particular colony or dependent nation involved.

Translated into formal Marxist language, the two factors to be considered are:

1. "the concrete historical conditions" present at the time;
2. "the degree of development of class contradictions, the class-consciousness and degree of organisation of the proletariat" in the colony or dependent nation involved. 27

This "dual character" of independence movements (i.e., their double objective of gaining national freedom and overthrowing capitalism) enables the Communist theorist to neatly second-guess the outcome of any specific liberation movement, no matter what results the movement may have had in terms of actual freedom. Thus, if the newly gained independence should happen to conflict in some way with the practical aims of the Soviet Union or the Communist International, the independence movement can be immediately condemned for having "stopped short" of its "real" goal - the overthrow of capitalism and feudalism - and for having fallen a victim to "bourgeois nationalism."

The following statement from William Z. Foster's book, Outline Political History of the Americas, provides a good example of the Communist position in this respect:

"The Mexican Revolution (1910 - ed.)... was not a socialist revolution. It was directed against feudalism and imperialism, not against the capitalist system as a whole.... The revolution did not solve the basic problems of the Mexican people....

"The greatest weakness of the Mexican Revolution, from the very start, was the fact that the working class did not assume the leading role.... The non-working class leadership slowed the revolution on all fronts, prevented it from realizing its limited program, and also diverted the revolution from its potentially anticapitalist trends....

". . . One of the very greatest lessons taught by the historic Mexican struggle was the fundamental necessity for a strong Communist Party, one that would have enabled the Mexican people to realize the full revolutionary potentialities of their struggle....

". . . the Mexican Revolution was a dress rehearsal of a still greater revolution in the future. This eventual revolution will not have petty bourgeois leaders at its head; it will be led by the working class and the Communist Party, and instead of stopping short while still in the capitalist jungle, it will lay the basis for resolutely pressing along the road to socialism."²⁸

This conception of the liberation movement as only a "phase" of the socialist revolution allows the Communist room to maneuver in alternately supporting or denouncing specific groups or policies relating to the independence struggle. He may, for instance, during a "united front" period of World Communism, vigorously encourage a coalition between the working class and the bourgeoisie and even carefully praise such avowed anti-Communist leaders as Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek of China or former President Cardenas of Mexico. Such policies are easily justified by playing up the theme of national independence and national unity against imperialist oppressor nations.

On the other hand, when it suits his purpose, the Communist may bitterly attack any suggestions of an alliance between the working class and the bourgeoisie and violently condemn all national leaders who are not in complete sympathy with Communism. This abrupt shift is achieved by simply stressing the all-important "second phase" of the liberation movement (i. e., socialist revolution) and by labeling all persons or programs that aim only at national independence as "nationalist deviators," "petty bourgeois chauvinists," etc.

But, while affording the Communists definite advantages in quickly adapting their propaganda line to changes in Soviet tactics, the "dual objective" theory of liberation movements has caused Communist leaders some of their most anxious moments. The Party organizer or Daily Worker editorial writer is constantly in danger of failing to correctly interpret the rapidly changing Moscow line and, therefore, either overstressing the "independence" factor or the "socialist revolution" element of the liberation struggle.

Above all, the Communist spokesman must be careful not to commit himself so strongly to either "phase" that a complete reversal in policy with little or no forewarning might prove embarrassing. He must, in summary, tread a narrow path between overemphasis on the purely national factors in the liberation movement and the purely revolutionary aspects. In the carefully chosen words of Georgi Dimitroff, former General Secretary of the Communist International, the "correct" Marxist position is to avoid both "bourgeois nationalism" and "national nihilism."²⁹

"REVOLUTIONIZING THE COLONIAL RESERVES"

The plain fact that Communists have no sympathy towards the motives of national liberation movements or towards national independence as such, but are only allying themselves with such movements as a temporary expedient, can be realized from such frank statements as the following made by Stalin to the Soviet people:

"You know, comrades, that we....represent the vanguard of the world revolution. You know that we were the first to break through the general capitalist front....You know that we went as far as Warsaw (in 1919 - ed.), that we then retreated, entrenching ourselves in the positions we considered strongest...from that moment we realised that the international revolutionary movement was slowing down, and from that moment our policy changed from a policy of offensive to a policy of defensive...we decided that we needed a respite, that we must heal our wounds, the wounds received by the vanguard, the proletariat, that we must establish contact with the peasant rear...the reserves of the West and the reserves of the East, the heavy reserves which form the main rear-line reserves of world capitalism. It is of these reserves...which constitute the rear-line of world imperialism...that we must speak when discussing the national question."

"Two things are possible; either we succeed in stirring up and revolutionising the far imperialist rear - the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East - and thereby hasten the fall of capitalism, or we muff it, and thereby strengthen imperialism and weaken the force of our movement." 30

"Lenin was right in saying that the national movement of the oppressed countries should be judged not from the point of view of formal democracy (i. e., socialist ideals - ed.), but from the point of view of the actual results in the sum total of the struggle against imperialism, that is to say, 'not in an isolated way, but on a world scale.' 31

From such statements as the foregoing, it is obvious that the informed Communist, whatever passionate appeals he might make to excite the patriotism of colonial and minority groups, looks upon the national liberation struggle as merely an unexpected windfall to be used to weaken and disorganize capitalist society. Marxist theorists have even coined a phrase to describe this tactic. It is called "revolutionizing the colonial reserves."

This stratagem is expressed in the following manner:

"If Europe and America may be called the front, the scene of the main engagements between socialism and imperialism, the non - sovereign nations and the colonies, with their raw materials, fuel, food and vast store of human material, should be regarded as the rear, the reserve of imperialism. In order to win a war one must not only triumph at the front but also revolutionise the enemy's rear, his reserves." ³²

"Leninism... recognizes that there are revolutionary capabilities inherent in the national liberation movement of the oppressed countries, and that they can be utilised for the purpose of overthrowing the common enemy, for the purpose of overthrowing imperialism.... Hence the necessity for the proletariat supporting, vigorously and actively supporting, the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent peoples." ³³

"Having sown the seeds of revolution both in the centres of imperialism as well as in its rear, having weakened the might of imperialism in the 'mother countries' and having shaken its domination in the colonies, the October Revolution (Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 - ed.) has thereby jeopardized the very existence of world capitalism as a whole." ³⁴ (Underscored words are italicized in original text - ed.)

"The October Revolution has shaken imperialism not only in the centres of its domination, not only in the 'mother countries.' It has also struck blows at the rear of imperialism, its periphery, having undermined the rule of imperialism in the colonial and dependent countries." ³⁵

FLEXIBILITY OF COMMUNIST THEORY

With such a convenient yardstick to measure the merit of any particular liberation movement, namely, whether it is anti-imperialist or anti-capitalist in its effects, irrespective of its purpose, the Communists are able to

Approved For Release 2004/01/12 : CIA-RDP65-00756R000300040001-4
picture any national independence cause as either "revolutionary" or
"reactionary," "anti-fascist" or "imperialist," "progressive" or "counter-
revolutionary," all according to the changing mood and practical needs of the
world revolutionary movement or the Soviet Union.

The flexibility of Communist theory with respect to the "national
question" was clearly brought out by Stalin during the course of a lecture
delivered in 1924:

"The unquestionable revolutionary character of the overwhelming
majority of national movements is as relative and specific as
the possible reactionary character of certain national movements.
The revolutionary character of a national movement in the
conditions of imperialist oppression does not necessarily
presuppose the existence of proletarian elements in the
movement, the existence of a revolutionary or a republican
programme of the movement, (or) the existence of a democratic
basis for the movement. The struggle which the Emir of
Afghanistan is waging for the independence of his country is
objectively a revolutionary struggle, despite the monarchist
views of the Emir and his entourage, for it weakens, dis-
integrates and undermines imperialism.... For the same
reason, the struggle which the Egyptian merchants and
bourgeois intellectuals are waging for the independence of
their country is objectively revolutionary despite the bourgeois
origin and bourgeois calling of the leaders of the Egyptian national
movement and despite the fact that they are opposed to socialism;
whereas the fight the British Labour Government is waging to per-
petuate Egypt's state of subjection is for the same reason a
reactionary struggle, despite the proletarian origin and the
proletarian calling of the members of that government and despite
the fact that they are 'for' socialism." 36 (Underscored words are
italicized in original text - ed.)

Moreover, by simply applying a touch of "dialectical reasoning,"
the Communist political analyst can easily reverse his field a half-dozen times
when discussing the same liberation movement. Thus, the struggle of the

Chinese people to gain national independence has been branded during one period as "chauvinistic" and "anti-revolutionary," and several months later applauded as "patriotic" and "progressive."

For the non-Communist reader, the key to an understanding of the many sudden shifts in Communist Party policy concerning any given independence movement lies in examining the objectives and strategy of international Communism (i. e., Soviet Union) at that particular time.

During the last twenty-five years, for example, Soviet policy has passed through five distinct phases, alternating between a militant, revolutionary, or offensive attitude and a passive, evolutionary, defensive pose... The "people's front" era (1935-1939) and the "unity-for-victory" period (1941-1945) are examples of the defensive, cooperative strategy adopted by World Communism during periods of danger for the Soviet Union when the support, or at least the tolerance, of the Western democracies was needed.

On the other hand, during the period 1945-1952 (so-called "cold war" stage), from 1939 to 1941 (when Hitler-Stalin Non-Aggression Pact was in effect), and during the late 1920's and early 1930's, the Soviet dictatorship felt comparatively secure, and therefore Communist propaganda was aggressive and openly hostile to the Western democracies.

Communist doctrine dealing with the national and colonial questions has undergone a corresponding evolution. During the offensive phases of World Communism, national liberation and colonial movements have generally been

encouraged to become as radical as possible and cautioned not to enter into any alliances with the bourgeoisie of their own nation. By contrast, during the defensive stages of International Communism, independence movements have usually been urged to modify their demands and even to join forces with the native bourgeoisie in a "united front" against rival bourgeoisie.

Several examples of the vacillating course of Communist Party propaganda on the national question will be offered later in this study.

In summary, it may be said that Communists have no fixed principles concerning national or colonial problems; that Marxist "theory" may be applied to the most diverse sets of facts and still manage to find some justification in the ambiguous "teachings" of Stalin or Lenin relating to the national question; and that the real motive for any specific Communist policy in this field is to be found in the over-all aims of International Communism at that particular time.

An excellent example of the flexibility of Communist theory concerning the national question is afforded by a study of the strange career of a principle, "Self-Determination of Nations," in Communist literature.

SELF-DETERMINATION OF NATIONS

One of the cornerstones of early Marxist doctrine with respect to the national question was the principle that all nations have the right of self-determination, i. e., the right to manage their own affairs and develop their own institutions and policies entirely free from outside interference. The first

Communist statements dealing with the national question are especially insistent on the principle of self-determination and support this principle in almost unequivocal terms. For example, in a thesis written in 1913, Stalin declared:

"Social Democratic parties (i.e., Communist Parties - ed.) in all countries... proclaim the right of nations to self-determination. The right of self-determination means that only the nation itself has the right to determine its destiny, that no one has the right forcibly to interfere in the life of the nation, to destroy its schools and other institutions, to violate its habits and customs, to repress its language, or curtail its rights." 37

"A nation has the right freely to determine its own destiny. It has the right to arrange its life as it sees fit, without, of course, stamping on the rights of other nations. That is beyond dispute." 38

"The right of self-determination is an essential element in the solution of the national problem." 39

"The right of self-determination means that a nation can arrange its life according to its own will. It has the right to arrange its life on the basis of autonomy. It has the right to enter into federal relations with other nations. It has the right to complete secession. Nations are sovereign and all nations are equal." 40

It may be noted that the above-quoted statements, boldly championing the principle of self-determination, were made prior to the Russian Revolution of 1917 and at a time when the Communists had nothing to lose and everything to gain by espousing such an ideal. As long as the czarist regime was still in control and the Communists did not exercise political power or control any territory of their own, the concept of self-determination could not embarrass them in actual practice and, at the same time, was calculated to attract to the

revolutionary banner the oppressed national minorities of both czarist Russia and Europe.

SELF-DETERMINATION BECOMES "REACTIONARY"

With the success of the Bolshevik Revolution, however, the Communists were suddenly faced with the task of organizing and consolidating into the new Soviet state the great complex of racial, ethnic and religious minorities that had formerly comprised the czarist empire. The "national question" was abruptly catapulted from the realm of theory and abstraction into explosive reality.

Communist theorists wasted little time in revising the principle of self-determination of nations to fit this new environment and by 1921 they were contemptuously referring to self-determination as a "bourgeois" and "imperialist" slogan.

In an article written in 1918, shortly after the Bolsheviks' seizure of power, Stalin indicated the compromising position that Communists should take in the future when dealing with the principle of self-determination and with the national question:

"The national question is not something self-contained and fixed for all time. Being only part of the general question of the transformation of the existing order, the national question is wholly determined by the conditions of the social environment, the character of the power in the country and by the whole course of social development generally. This is being strikingly borne out during the period of revolution in Russia, when the national question and the national movement in the border regions of Russia are rapidly changing their character in accordance with the course and issue of the revolution." 41

The reasons for this abrupt shift in theory were evident. Following the overthrow of the czarist regime, a number of independent national movements had sprung up in the border and non-Russian regions (e.g., the Baltic area, Armenia, Georgia, White Russia and the Ukraine) which showed little inclination to merge with the new Bolshevik state in Great Russia and, in fact, demanded national independence under the principle of self-determination. Stalin was well aware of the "weaknesses" of self-determination in these new circumstances:

"The right of nations to self-determination was interpreted to mean the right of the national bourgeoisie in the border regions to take power into its own hands and to take advantage of the February Revolution in order to form its 'own' national state. A further development of the revolution did not and could not come into the calculations of the above-mentioned bourgeois institutions. And the fact was overlooked that tsarism was being replaced by a naked and bare-faced imperialism, that this imperialism was a stronger and more dangerous foe of the nationalities, and the basis of new national oppression." ⁴²

"Thus the old bourgeois-democratic interpretation of the principle of self-determination became a fiction and lost its revolutionary significance. It was clear that under such circumstances there could be no question of the abolition of national oppression or of the independence of the small, national states." ⁴³

Stalin argued, in effect, that the principle of self-determination was valid only in conjunction with the proletarian revolution; that it did not apply to the establishment of independent "bourgeois" states but only to the formation of workers' republics (which, of course, would speedily join forces with the new Soviet government in Greater Russia). This revision of the concept of self-determination was explained by Stalin as follows:

"Now at last it has become obvious that the emancipation of the oppressed nationalities is inconceivable without a rupture with imperialism, without the overthrow of the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nationalities and without the transfer of power to the toiling masses of these nationalities. Thus the old bourgeois conception of the principle of self-determination, with its slogan 'All power to the national bourgeoisie,' was exposed and cast aside by the very course of the revolution. The socialist conception of self-determination, with its slogan 'All power to the toiling masses of the oppressed nationalities,' entered into its own and obtained the opportunity of being applied in practice." 44

Having oriented the principle of self-determination to the needs of the revolution, Stalin was later able to denounce both the theory of self-determination and its proponents whenever it suited the Communists' practical interests. The following examples demonstrate the scorn and suspicion with which Marxists came to regard this once "inalienable" right of nations:

"The mortal sin of the Second International and its leader, Kautsky, consists incidentally in the fact that they have always wandered into the bourgeois conception of national self-determination, that they have never understood the revolutionary meaning of the latter, that they were unable or unwilling to put the national question on the revolutionary footing of an open fight against imperialism." 45

"Comrade Chicherin's third mistake is that he speaks too much of national self-determination, which has in effect become an empty slogan easily adaptable to the use of the imperialists. Comrade Chicherin has strangely forgotten that we discarded this slogan two years ago (1919 - ed.). Our programme no longer contains this slogan... neither in my theses nor in the programme of the Party is there a single word about 'self-determination.'" 46

"We have long ago abandoned the nebulous slogans of self-determination--there is no need to revive them." 47

"It is not surprising that the imperialists, realising how convenient for them this peculiarity of the slogan of self-determination is, proclaimed this slogan as their own. As we know, the imperialist war, the aim of which was to enslave peoples, was fought under the flag of self-determination. Thus the vague slogan of self-determination was transformed from an instrument of emancipation of nations and equality of nations into an instrument for taming nations, an instrument for keeping nations in subjection to imperialism." 48

SELF-DETERMINATION IS ABANDONED

This astonishing reversal on the question of self-determination was justified by the Communists chiefly by two lines of argument. First, they rationalized, the question of self-determination was a meaningless one in view of the all-out conflict between world capitalism and world socialism; i.e., unless a newly established independent nation joined forces with the socialist camp (Soviet Union), it was bound to become economically and politically enslaved to the Old World imperialist states. Weighing the demand of various Russian border nations for complete independence, Stalin wrote in 1920:

"Apart from the fact that the separation of the border regions would undermine the revolutionary might of Central Russia, which is stimulating the movement for the emancipation of the West and the East, the seceded border regions themselves would inevitably fall into bondage to international imperialism. One has only to glance at Georgia, Armenia, Poland, Finland, etc., which have seceded from Russia but which have retained only the semblance of independence, while in reality they have been converted into unconditional vassals of the Entente; one has only,

finally, to recall the recent case of the Ukraine and Azerbaijan, the former of which was plundered by German capital and the latter by the Entente, in order to realise the counter-revolutionary nature of the demand for the secession of the border regions under present international conditions. When a life-and-death struggle is being waged, and is spreading, between proletarian Russia and the imperialist Entente, only two alternatives confront the border regions: either they join forces with Russia, and then the toiling masses of the border regions will be emancipated from imperialist oppression; or they join forces with the Entente, and then the yoke of imperialism is inevitable." ⁴⁹

"So-called independence of a so-called independent Georgia, Armenia, Poland, Finland, etc., is only an illusion, and conceals the utter dependence of these apologies for states on one group of imperialists or another." ⁵⁰

Secondly, the Communists, as though suddenly realizing that the "inalienable" right of nations to self-determination was somehow incongruous with the fundamental Marxian view of history as first and foremost a class struggle, began to stress the fact that the principle of self-determination was in every case subordinate to the needs of the proletarian revolution; that the "national question," after all, could only be considered as part of the greater problem of the "labour question." At first, this idea was broached in very tentative fashion. Writing in 1917, when the success of the Bolshevik Revolution was still in doubt, Stalin declared:

"The question of the right of nations freely to secede must not be confused with the question that a nation must necessarily secede at any given moment. This latter question must be settled by the party of the proletariat in each particular case independently, according to circumstances.... Thus we are at liberty to agitate for or against secession, according to the interests of the proletariat, of the proletarian revolution." 51 (Underscored words are italicized in original text - ed.)

Later, when the revolution was an accomplished fact and when the need to appease nationalistic-minded minority groups in the border regions had lessened, Stalin pointed out the secondary position of the national question (or self-determination) in more forceful language:

"It should be borne in mind that besides the right of nations to self-determination there is also the right of the working class to consolidate its power, and to the latter right the right of self-determination is subordinate. There are occasions when the right of self-determination conflicts with the other, the higher right - the right of a working class that has assumed power to consolidate its power. In such cases - this must be said bluntly - the right to self-determination cannot and must not serve as an obstacle to the exercise by the working class of its right to dictatorship. The former must give way to the latter." 52

With this frank admission, Stalin let the cat out of the bag, in effect, conceding that the Communist movement, although supporting self-determination in principle, would not be so foolish as to subscribe to this ideal whenever it conflicted with the realistic aims of the Bolshevik dictatorship! The following passage from Stalin's writings on the national question is also illuminating in this connection.

"It must therefore not be forgotten when handing out all sorts of promises to the nationals, when bowing and scraping before the representatives of the nationalities... that the sphere of action of the national question, its competence, so to speak, are, in view of our external and internal situation, confined within the sphere of action and competence of the 'labour question' as the fundamental question."⁵³

"RIGHT OF SECESSION" REPLACES SELF-DETERMINATION

Although, as the foregoing quotations plainly show, Communist theorists had virtually discarded the principle of self-determination in order to justify Bolshevik suppression of independence movements in the border regions of Russia, they were nonetheless careful to retain enough of the principle of autonomy for nations so as not to alienate a great potential revolutionary ally, namely, the ever-increasing national movements throughout the colonial and semicolonial world.

Having discovered that "self-determination" was an excellent servant but a very poor master, the Communists tried to salvage the propaganda value of this principle, while at the same time freeing themselves from its "counter-revolutionary" logic. This attempt took the form of substituting for "self-determination" another attractive slogan: "the right of political secession," that is, the right of any nation to freely secede from any federation, state or empire to which it belonged.

A study of Marxist literature on the national question during the period 1919 - 1923 reveals a gradual, almost imperceptible, substitution of the phrase "right of political secession" for the term "self-determination." By 1923, although no Marxist writer had troubled to distinguish between "secession" and "self-determination" and although the two principles appeared to be similar if not identical, Stalin was able to announce:

"...our national programme is based on the right of nations to independent political existence, formerly called the right of nations to self-determination."⁵⁴

It is plain from the following statements that the Communists were convinced that by proclaiming the principle of secession as opposed to self-determination, they had somehow solved their dilemma and discovered a "revolutionary" concept which would apply to the capitalist world without embarrassing the Soviet dictatorship:

"...Our programme speaks not of national self-determination... but of a better-minted and more clearly defined slogan - the right of nations to political secession. These are two different things... neither in my theses nor in the programme of the Party is there a single word about 'self-determination.' What they speak of is the right of peoples to political secession. But for us at the present moment, when the movement for emancipation has flared up in the colonies, this slogan is a revolutionary slogan."⁵⁵

"The course of events in recent years all over the world... the growth of the movement in the colonies... demanded that this slogan (self-determination - ed.) be cast aside and replaced by another slogan, a revolutionary slogan,

which would serve to dissipate the atmosphere of mistrust entertained by the toiling masses of the non-sovereign nations towards the proletarians of the dominant nations and to clear the way for the equality of nations and for the unity of the toilers of all nations. Such a slogan is the slogan issued by the Communists demanding the right of non-sovereign nations and colonies to political secession." ⁵⁶ (Under-scored word is italicized in original text - ed.)

"RIGHT OF SECESSION" IN SOVIET UNION

Almost invariably Communist propagandists have applied the "right of political secession" to the colonies and semicolonial nations of the capitalist world. Whenever this principle is appealed to in connection with the national minority groups of Russia itself, the question is brushed aside as academic:

"Some people ask a purely scholastic question--whether after amalgamation the republics (border republics of Russia - ed.) remain independent. This is a scholastic question. Their independence is restricted, for every amalgamation involves a certain restriction of the rights of the amalgamating parties. But the elements of independence of each of these republics undoubtedly remain, for each republic retains the right to leave the Union at its own discretion. There you have the elements of independence, the maximum of independence, which is potentially retained by each of these republics." ⁵⁷ (Underscoring added - ed.)

"Of course, none of our republics would actually raise the question of seceding from the USSR." ⁵⁸

Moreover, it is pointed out that the continued federation of Soviet nationalities under the proletarian dictatorship is guaranteed by common economic, military and diplomatic needs:

"Hence, in isolation, the existence of the various Soviet republics is uncertain and unstable, because of the menace to their existence offered by the capitalist states. The joint interests of the Soviet republics... imperatively dictate the political union of the various Soviet republics as the only means of escaping imperialist bondage and national oppression."⁵⁹

". . . under the conditions of capitalist encirclement, not a single Soviet republic taken alone can regard itself as secure against economic exhaustion and military destruction on the part of world imperialism."⁶⁰

"The border regions of Russia... are inevitably doomed to imperialist bondage without the political, military and organizational support of more developed Central Russia."⁶¹

As in the case of self-determination, Communists have been careful to caution that the "right to secession" is only applicable within the greater interests of the world-wide proletarian revolution:

"The demand for the secession of the border regions from Russia... must be rejected... primarily because it is fundamentally opposed to the interests of the mass of the peoples both of the center (Russia proper - ed.) and of the border regions."⁶²

". . . the question of secession must be determined in each particular case independently, in accordance with existing circumstances, and for this reason the question of the recognition must not be confused with the expediency of secession in any 'given circumstance'."⁶³ (Underlined word italicized in original text - ed.)

CONCLUSIONS

It can be seen that, with all of the foregoing qualifications and evasions, very little remains of the principles of self-determination or political secession. A few Marxist writers have, in fact, even admitted that when Communists raise the cry of national independence and the "rights of nations," they are merely employing good "tactics" to promote the revolution. One Communist propagandist, in a moment of candor, stated the case quite clearly:

"It is for the purpose of instilling a brotherly confidence in the various sections of the proletariat that the programme of the Communist proclaims the right of the labouring class of every nation to complete independence.... It is self-evident that only by such tactics can the confidence of the proletariat as a whole be won.... Let us bear this in mind. The question is not of the right of the nation to independence, but of the right of the labouring classes. That means that the so-called 'will of the nation' is not in the least sacred to us. We consider sacred only the will of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat masses."⁶⁴ (Underscoring added - ed.)

Contemporary Communist spokesmen, apparently profiting from the experiences of Bolshevik leaders during the period 1913-1923 with the boomerang effect of "self-determination," have generally steered clear of any commitments to definite principles in the discussion of the national and colonial questions. Present-day Communist propaganda in this field endeavors to gain the sympathy of liberation movements by appealing to the "anti-imperialist" sentiments of the colonies and semicolonies, without recourse to any specific ideals, such as self-determination, which could later prove embarrassing.

However, in a few cases the propaganda value of the self-determination slogan has been so tempting that the Communists have found it advantageous to revive this motto and treat it as though it were still a cardinal principle of Marxism. The most striking example of this maneuver can be seen in the record of Communist Party "theory" dealing with the American Negro problem.

Periodically, American Communist leaders have resurrected the concept of "self-determination for the Black Belt" and demanded the creation of an independent Negro nation in the Southern United States. Invariably, the campaign for American Negro self-determination coincides with a militant or offensive phase of World Communism; whereas, during nonmilitant or "united front" phases of International Communism, the demand for Negro self-determination is conspicuously missing from the Communist platform!

That this is no mere coincidence cannot escape even the casual student of Communist doctrine. However, it furnishes an excellent example of the adeptness with which Marxist leaders can proclaim an "inalienable" principle, and then modify it, reinterpret it, revise it, virtually abandon it, and resurrect it, all according to the particular needs and mood of World Communism or the Soviet Union at any given moment.

PART II

APPLICATION OF COMMUNIST THEORY TO NATIONAL AND COLONIAL PROBLEMS AFFECTING UNITED STATES

U. S. AS AN IMPERIALIST POWER AND NATIONAL OPPRESSOR

The first task facing the American Communist Party with respect to the "national question" has been to clearly establish the fact that the United States, like all capitalist nations, is an imperialist state which consistently follows a policy of national oppression as part of a deliberate program of capitalist exploitation.

American Communist Party leaders have especially labored to overcome the widespread belief that the United States has few, if any, territorial or colonial ambitions, or that U. S. policy with respect to the backward nations is prompted in a large measure by moral principles and idealism.

William Z. Foster, National Chairman of the Communist Party, USA, attacked this popular idea, when he wrote during 1948:

"American capitalism, contrary to widespread capitalist denials, is imperialist in the fullest sense.... The United States is covering up its determined drive for imperialist world control with a blanket of hypocritically disarming pretenses, especially adapted to deceive the American and world democratic masses.... American imperialists... speak in the name of democracy and of the defense of world peace.... They are vociferous defenders of 'free enterprise,' 'free trade,' and 'free competition.' They also talk, tongue in cheek, of America's 'moral world leadership.'... This

leadership, allegedly forced upon their 'unwilling' capitalist shoulders, they claim they are carrying out for the benefit of all the world. . . . These democratic and pacifistic pretenses are, of course, merely a tipping of the hat to the deeply ingrained democratic and anti-militaristic sentiments of the American people."⁶⁵

Foster reiterated this idea in the following passage from his book,

Outline Political History of the Americas, published in 1951:

"To fool the gullible, the Wall Street monopolists and their publicity mouthpieces are as a rule very careful to hide their grandiose and sinister bid for world control behind a facade of euphonious statements about their historic duty to exercise 'world moral leadership' and professions of a selfless desire to do good to the rest of the peoples of the world."⁶⁶

METHODS OF U. S. IMPERIALISM

In an effort to account for the modest size of the U. S. colonial empire and to discredit the apparent high purpose of such American projects as the "Point Four Program," the "Good Neighbor Policy" and the Marshall Plan, Communist spokesmen have insisted that these seemingly nonimperialist policies are actually a sinister "ideological camouflage" to disguise the real purpose of "predatory" American imperialism.

The Communists argue that U. S. imperialism could not operate under the same system of "crude," outright colonialism formerly used by Great Britain, France and other imperialist powers because of certain historical facts. They reason that U. S. capitalism was a "late-comer" in the imperialist era and therefore discovered that most of the available colonial areas had already

been seized by Great Britain, France, Japan, etc. Moreover, by the time the United States was ready to launch its imperialist program (about 1890, according to Marxist historians), there had already developed a strong anti-imperialist movement in the backward nations in the form of national liberation movements and colonial revolutions.

Consequently, American imperialism, in order to "wean" colonial areas away from other capitalist powers and in order to overcome the bitter resistance of colonial and semicolonial peoples to further oppression, was forced to abandon the cruder method of undisguised colonialism and to adopt instead a more subtle, insidious approach. In short, American imperialism was forced to mask its "ruthless" aims behind a program which, on the surface, would appear beneficial to both the colonial and semicolonial peoples and to the world in general.

The well-known Communist position in this regard is expressed in such statements as the following:

"...American imperialism...operates only partly through colonial rule, made classic by British imperialism....The reason for this was that American imperialism was a late-comer on the world stage - Britain, Germany, France and Japan having already seized most of the available 'colonial' areas - and that the developing national liberation movements from the beginning of this century in the colonies and dependent countries were making it extremely difficult to establish new colonial empires....Thus it came to pass that American imperialism was not of the same colonial type as British imperialism. This did not make it any less reactionary or imperialistic....The so-called anti-colonialism was only a weapon of American imperialism - an 'ideological' and political weapon - for imperialist penetration...."⁶⁷

"One of the most widespread expressions of the myth of 'American exceptionalism' among the American workers is the belief that this country is not a colonial power. This misconception is due in part to the characteristic hypocrisy with which American imperialism has shrouded its brutal rule and dominating influence in the colonial and semicolonial countries of the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and Latin America.... All of these reactionary lines of policy (American imperialist program-ed.) are being carried out under the most extreme demagogic, even to the point of President Truman's fantastic big lie that American imperialism is now the 'champion of the darker peoples' against the so-called 'tyranny of Communist imperialism.'"⁶⁸

"America has long been a colonial, an imperialist power.... America is rapidly replacing England as the dominant colonial power of the world, although it is exacting that dominance through many new forms. This is evident from its aggressive war to throttle the peoples of the Far East (Korean War - ed.),... its Marshall Plan, its imperialist Point 4, the rearmament of its European satellites (NATO - ed.), etc...."⁶⁹ (underscoring added-ed.)

The "many new forms" by which the United States is indicted as being the "biggest and strongest imperialist country in world history"⁷⁰ are said to include economic, political and military pressure together with mass propaganda aimed at creating anti-Soviet and anti-Communist "hysteria."

Following this line of attack, American Communist Party leaders have denounced all of the principal planks of U. S. foreign policy affecting the colonial areas or the so-called "dependent" nations (e.g., Latin America). A few examples will show the manner in which Communist propaganda has tried to subvert U. S. policy in this field:

Good Neighbor Policy

"Widely, in Latin America and elsewhere, the Good Neighbor Policy was mistakenly conceived as an abandonment of imperialism by the United States. All of a sudden Yankee imperialism was supposed to have become progressive.... But in reality, the Good Neighbor Policy was simply a reformulation of the old imperialism in order for it to counter more effectively the growing nationalism and democratic spirit of the Latin American peoples, as well as to offset the increased imperialist competition. It was the adoption of more efficient methods of imperialist penetration."⁷¹

"It must be firmly kept in mind that the 'Good Neighbor' policy of the Administration has become nothing else but a cloak for predatory imperialism and militant aggression."⁷²

"American imperialism is trying to surmount its difficulties in Latin America by an intensified and elaborate campaign of demagogery. The United States, President Roosevelt announces, directing his voice toward the South, is no longer an imperialist nation. The American vulture, having shed its claws, has turned over-night into a 'good neighbor.'... Under the guise of abandoning the Monroe Doctrine, through this new formula, United States imperialism would be utilizing its puppet governments to support the Doctrine of American domination... (But) American imperialism's pretensions to magnanimity cannot conceal the same old club behind its back."⁷³

Pan-Americanism

"Pan-Americanism has come to mean but one thing - United States rulership of the western hemisphere."⁷⁴

"An aggressive political expression of Latin American domination by the United States, Pan-Americanism is a weapon that is turned against the similar aims and aggression of rival imperialisms, principally British."⁷⁵

Monroe Doctrine

"Undoubtedly, in the formulation of the Monroe Doctrine (1823 - ed.) there already lurked the idea of establishing United States hegemony over the whole western hemisphere."⁷⁶

"Originally the Monroe Doctrine was issued ostensibly in the general defense of all the young republics of the western hemisphere. But, being a unilateral statement by the United States, this country has ever since put such interpretations upon the Doctrine as it has seen fit in its own capitalist interests."⁷⁷

"The magic formula of the Monroe Doctrine: 'Latin America belongs to the United States,' has assumed many forms. Under it whole countries have been held by American armed forces for decades, cities have been bombed, fake revolutions fomented to further the interests of Yankee imperialism, treaties rammed down at the point of bayonets, millions of acres of land plundered, and thousands of natives slaughtered.... The persistence, penetration and precision of this doctrine are characteristics of United States imperialism in one of its most fundamental forms, colonial domination."⁷⁸

Open Door Policy for China

"...the 'Open Door' is fundamentally an imperialist policy, taking this form for the United States because of its relatively late arrival upon the Far Eastern scene. By the 'Open Door' is meant: (a) that China must not shut its gates to the imperialists; (b) that American imperialism shall not be denied by rival imperialist powers 'equal opportunity' to plunder China...."⁷⁹

"...the 'Open Door' policy as employed by Great Britain and inherited by the United States, was part of the diplomacy of imperialism. It was imperialist because its objectives were imperialist prizes. It was a policy designed to preserve and even extend foreign domination and exploitation of China and the Chinese...."⁸⁰

Point Four Program

"President Truman's 'Point Four' program is also primarily an attempt to extend and tighten United States monopolist grip upon the undeveloped colonial and semicolonial countries.

It is thus a major economic and political weapon, along with the Marshall Plan, for fastening United States imperialist control upon the whole capitalist world."⁸¹

"The main purpose of the much-vaunted Point 4 is to guarantee the economic penetration and the subjugation of the undeveloped colonial areas of the world - Asia and Africa, in particular - by the American monopolies and trusts... this program has nothing whatsoever in common with achieving the equality of the colonial and darker peoples."⁸²

Communist propagandists have not only strenuously attacked American policies bearing directly on colonial or dependent nations, they have also frequently tried to establish a connection between the "national and colonial problem" and virtually every major feature of United States foreign policy. For instance, they have often pictured U. S. intervention in Korea as part of a calculated imperialist program to crush the liberation movements of Asia and to perpetuate a policy of national oppression in Asia.

"The aggression against Korea was launched with the hope of securing all of Korea as a base of operation against China, the liberation movements of Asia, and the Soviet Union."⁸³ (Underscoring added - ed.)

"The war in Korea is not a civil war. It is not a war between the people of the North and the South. It is not, as the Truman-Acheson-Dulles bipartisan combination would have the American people believe, a war to 'repel the Communist invasion of South Korea.'... It is a war of imperialist aggression. It is Wall Street's war!... American imperialism needed the Korean 'incident' to speed up its war drive, to intervene openly in the countries of the Pacific where the imperialists have not succeeded in 'containing' the liberation struggles."⁸⁴

"American imperialism has unleashed war - a reckless adventurist war of annihilation - in order to drown in blood the struggle of 30, 000, 000 people on the Korean peninsula for national unification and independence.... American planes rain bombs on Korean cities and villages, murdering and maiming Korean men, women and children. American troops die in agony...not to promote the cause of freedom and liberation, but to perpetuate colonial enslavement." 85

The day following President Truman's order to American troops to resist the North Korean invasion of South Korea, the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, issued a statement denouncing American intervention. The statement read in part:

"... The military provocation in Korea (by U.S. troops - ed.) is planned as a smokescreen behind which to intervene against the struggle for independence of the peoples of Korea, China, Formosa, the Philippines, Viet Nam, Indonesia and Malaya.... The bi-partisan war coalition has solely one aim: to conquer the peoples of Asia, to rob them of their natural resources, to multiply Big Business' profits from a subjugated world." 86

Communist leaders have even sought to characterize the entire European Recovery Program or so-called Marshall Plan as a cleverly engineered scheme on the part of the United States to subjugate the world and oppress the nations of Europe, Africa and Asia. During February, 1948, when Congress was considering adoption of the European Recovery Program, the Communist Party, USA, submitted a formal statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. This statement described the ERP as having been "designed to subvert the national sovereignty of the countries of Western Europe and place them under the domination of Wall Street" and to "convert them into helpless dependencies of the United States." 87

An article appearing in the January, 1950, issue of Political Affairs blasted the Marshall Plan as:

"...an economic, political and military lever with the help of which U. S. imperialists subordinate the economy of Western Europe to their control and dictate, striving to turn it into a colonial adjunct of the United States of America."88

The foregoing examples serve to show how Communists have endeavored to connect the question of national liberation and colonial independence with the most divergent and apparently unrelated issues. In reviewing Communist literature dealing with the "national question," therefore, it is not unusual to find detailed references to such diverse topics as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Taft-Hartley Act, the Federal Loyalty Program, and the development of nuclear energy. Communist propagandists purport to believe that U. S. policy concerning all of these issues - and many more - is intimately tied in with a monstrous plot on the part of American capitalism to create a world-wide system of colonies and national oppression.

For a good example of this type of reasoning, the reader is referred to an article by Benjamin J. Davis, National Board member of the Communist Party, USA, which appeared in the December, 1950, issue of Political Affairs. Although the article is entitled "On the Colonial Liberation Movements," Davis makes reference to such varied subjects as the Korean War, the Taft-Hartley Law, the McCarran Communist Control Bill, American labor union leadership, the United Nations, the Marshall Plan, the Point Four Program, the Stockholm Peace Petition and the atom bomb.

EXTENT AND AIMS OF U. S. COLONIAL EMPIRE

It is popularly believed that the American colonial empire comprises at the most the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Alaska, the Virgin Islands, the Panama Canal Zone, and several small naval bases in the Pacific, having a total population of approximately 13,000,000. Communist propaganda, however, portrays the American colonial system as consisting of some thirty countries with an aggregate population of about 200,000,000. Included in the list of U.S. "colonies," according to the Communists, are all of the above-named countries as well as the following: Canada, Cuba, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Chile, Bolivia, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Israel, Greece, and Liberia.

Victor Perlo's American Imperialism, a book advertised in the July, 1951, Political Affairs as a "brilliant extension of and application" of Lenin's theses on imperialism, charged that the population of the U.S. empire as of 1947, "broadly defined," amounted to 563 million persons or about one-fourth of the total population of the earth! ⁸⁹ Perlo arrived at this total as follows:

U. S. proper.....	144 million
Complete domination - minimum estimate of U.S.	
colonial and semicolonial empire.....	197 million
In process of transition to U.S. colonial domination (Argentina, Spain, Egypt, Thailand, and Yugoslavia). .	96 million
Military occupation, colonial rule not yet consolidated (Japan, Western Germany).....	126 million
Total population of U.S. empire.....	<u>563 million</u>

George Marion, former correspondent for the Daily Worker, in a book entitled, Bases and Empire published in 1948, drew a chart of the American

"strategic empire" at the close of World War II which showed a total population of more than 667,000,000 and a total area of more than 110,000,000 square miles including nearly 14,000,000 square miles of land area.⁹⁰ Moreover, Marion was able to reach these staggering figures without crediting the U. S. with any colonies or semicolonies in Europe or Africa, an omission with which most Communists would take issue!

One of the reasons for such extravagant claims concerning the scope of the American "colonial empire" is obviously the fact that the Communists hope to persuade the noncapitalist world that the United States poses a threat to the independence of all nations and, in fact, that the United States seeks nothing less than domination of the entire world.

George Marion, after carefully compiling a "chart" of the American empire, concluded as follows:

"Thus the reality beyond the chart is this: the United States seeks literally global strategic hegemony."⁹¹

In an article appearing in the December, 1950, issue of Political Affairs, William Z. Foster, after finding that the United States had already succeeded in gaining domination of the capitalist world, charged that American imperialism would be satisfied by nothing short of a world-wide empire. Foster took special care to stress the danger to the colonial peoples of the world:

"The aim of American imperialism, of course, is not limited simply to exercising world hegemony over capitalism - which it has already, in considerable

measure, achieved. It drives for domination over the entire world; not only the capitalist segment of it, but the Socialist segment as well. Wall Street, in its grandiose plans and preparations for world conquest, far surpasses even the wildest dreams of Hitler and other would-be world conquerors of the past....

"The aggressive American imperialists... are proclaiming themselves to be the champions of the equality of all peoples; although, in reality, they themselves are definitely white supremacists and are seeking to establish Anglo-Saxon cultural, as well as political, dominion over the darker peoples of the world." ⁹²

Communist propaganda that the United States seeks world domination and, therefore, menaces the national independence of all countries - colonial, socialist and capitalist alike - dates back to the beginning of the cold war, or about 1946. Two more examples will suffice, again from the writings of William Z. Foster in 1948:

"American imperialism... lacks all restraint in its wild dream of complete and sole world domination. It is determined to rule alone, with other leading capitalist states relegated to minor satellite roles, if not reduced practically to the position of colonial possessions of the U.S." ⁹³

"The central objective of American imperialism is to be the supreme world master...." ⁹⁴

As most of the foregoing quotations illustrate, Communist propaganda relating to the national and colonial questions has dealt chiefly with the general features of the problem, such as the imperialist nature of American foreign policy and the resultant threat to the national independence of all countries. Communist literature for the most part has paid less

attention to specific liberation and colonial movements.

In other words, Communists usually do not consider any particular independence struggle on the part of a national group or dependent country primarily in terms of its own peculiar features. Instead, they invariably view each liberation movement from the standpoint of its connection with the struggle between socialism and capitalism - and from the standpoint of such rigid and overworked Marxian "laws" as the class struggle, "proletarian internationalism," "the uneven development of capitalism," etc. Similarly, in evaluating the success or failure of any liberation struggle, the Communists' emphasis has nearly always been placed on some hazy, underlying (or "revolutionary") meaning, rather than on specific and practical results.

Moreover, Communist writers frequently neglect or completely overlook all noneconomic factors which may be involved in specific cases of national oppression. They take little, if any, notice of the psychological, historical or geographical issues involved, which frequently are essential to a clear understanding of the problem. The oversimplification of national and colonial problems, this interpretation of the most complex cases of national oppression solely in terms of stereotyped Marxist formulas, is one of the major weaknesses of Communist propaganda in this field.

The following is a typical example of the Communist technique of magnifying supposed "revolutionary" (i. e., pro-Communist) factors in a specific case of national independence, thereby greatly oversimplifying and distorting the entire matter.

Shortly after the establishment of an independent state of Israel in 1948, Alexander Bittelman, leading Communist Party, USA, theoretician, wrote:

"The struggle for the independence and territorial integrity of the new Jewish state is part of the general struggle for peace, national independence and democracy. It is also a struggle for the liberation of the Arab peoples from British and Anglo-American imperialist domination. It is a fight to prevent the imperialists and warmakers from turning the Middle East into a major base of military operations in a new world war." 95 (Underscoring added - ed.)

The following provides a good example of the exaggeration of mysterious "anti-revolutionary" factors in evaluating a national independence movement without any effort whatever to consider concrete historical influences. Endeavoring to explain the recent break between Yugoslavia and the Cominform - which, on the surface at least, appeared to be a move towards greater national independence on the part of Yugoslavia - V. J. Jerome, editor of Political Affairs, blamed this counterrevolutionary development on the following shadowy factors:

"The nationalist spirit was further stimulated by intoxication with successes of the liberation movement and reconstruction immediately following the war. The Party leadership, departing from Marxian internationalism, in a purely opportunist fashion, encouraged this spirit of conceit and self-sufficiency, and itself sank to the low level of bourgeois-nationalist megalomania." 96

The Communists' pronounced tendency to discuss national and colonial problems in terms of broad generalities and hazy Marxist language, without squarely facing specific economic, political and social issues, is based

primarily on their desire to picture all national or colonial developments as evidence of the decline of capitalism or, conversely, the growth of socialism. All other issues are obscured in a maze of "dialectical" reasoning.

For example, in the above-listed statement by Alexander Bittelman on the establishment of the state of Israel, Bittelman blithely ignored the centuries-old struggle of the Jewish people for a homeland, the widespread persecution and massacre of Jews by Hitler and other vital historical factors leading to the formation of the new Jewish state. Instead, he portrayed the Jewish independence movement as a struggle against "British and Anglo-American imperialist domination" and as a fight "to prevent the imperialists and warmakers (i.e., capitalist states) from turning the Middle East into a major base of military operations in a new world war." This statement is an excellent example of the Communist technique of distorting historical events to agree with the "scientific" Marxist interpretation of history.

Although, as we have seen, the Communist approach to national and colonial questions is usually based on vague generalities, they have occasionally focused their propaganda on specific national groups and colonial countries. Needless to say, the Communists have centered their attack upon those colonial areas or national minorities which, they believe, best illustrate capitalist oppression and failure. In the case of the United States, the Communists have concentrated their fire for the most part on three national or colonial problems: namely, Puerto Rico, the Philippine Islands and the American Negro.

The following summary of Communist propaganda concerning Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands will illustrate the application of Communist theory concerning national liberation and colonial movements in two specific cases. No effort has been made to outline Communist propaganda relating to the American Negro, primarily because the great complexity of this topic is considered beyond the scope of this limited study. However, it is felt that this omission is justified by the fact that a number of excellent studies have already been made concerning the relationship between Communism and the Negro.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA CONCERNING PUERTO RICO

According to Communist historians, Puerto Rico was among the first victims of an American imperialist program which dates back to about 1890. The first step in this imperialist program of expansion, according to Communist writers, was to provoke a war with Spain in order to strip Puerto Rico, Cuba and the Philippines from the rapidly waning Spanish empire. The Spanish-American War of 1898 served as the "excuse" American imperialists needed to seize these strategic islands and launch the American colonial empire:

"About the turn of the century the capitalists of the United States, as budding imperialists, began to cast about for new worlds beyond the United States borders to conquer for the construction of a colonial system of their own....

"The sinking of the battleship Maine in Havana harbor on February 15, 1898, by parties still unknown, gave the imperialists the excuse they had long been seeking for a war against Spain.... After a few disastrous battles Spain surrendered, signing a peace treaty in December, 1898, which gave up Cuba and ceded Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines (for \$20,000,000) to the United States...."97

The Communists charge that United States' colonial rule in Puerto Rico is motivated primarily by Wall Street's desire to extort "super-profits" from the approximately two million natives of Puerto Rico. They assert that the United States has imposed a repressive "one-crop" system on Puerto Rico, the sugar industry, thereby stifling the development of a balanced economy and enabling American monopolists to ruthlessly control Puerto Rican wages and living standards by price-fixing, one-sided tariffs, etc.

Communist propagandists cite an imposing number of statistics tending to show the wretched condition of Puerto Rican living standards, health, schools, public works, etc., under American rule. Most American students of Puerto Rican affairs would, in fact, agree that great improvements should be made in the general living standards of the Puerto Rican people. However, it is significant that Communist literature on this point almost invariably points up the backward economic and social status of Puerto Rico by comparing the wages, literacy, health, etc., of the Puerto Rican worker with corresponding living standards of the American worker, who is acknowledged to have the highest standard of living in the world. Communist propaganda skillfully avoids any comparison of the contemporary Puerto Rican worker with his counterpart of 1898 (prior to American occupation) or with the average wage-earner in the Soviet Union today!

Although the colonial subjugation of Puerto Rico is held to be based chiefly on economic exploitation, the Communists assert that United States imperialism seeks to retain Puerto Rico as a colony for two other reasons:

1. to serve as a military and naval base for further imperialist aggression against South America;
2. to provide an outpost for political and ideological penetration of South America.

Cesar Andreu, former Chairman of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico, has summarized United States objectives in Puerto Rico in the following terms:

"The maintenance of the colonial status of Puerto Rico is of vital importance to the Wall Street and Washington war-makers. Puerto Rico is a strategic, military, naval, air, and atom bomb base, a political and ideological outpost for imperialist penetration into Latin America; and finally, a source for the extraction of superprofits. Puerto Rico is a major market for the monopolists, grossing a half billion dollars annually." 98

The central theme of American Communist Party propaganda concerning Puerto Rico has been a vigorous demand for complete independence from the United States. Unconditional independence and freedom from all forms of American interference in Puerto Rican affairs is pictured as a vital step in resolving all of the island's problems, economic, social, and political. As early as 1938, four years after the creation of a Communist Party in Puerto Rico, V. J. Jerome, editor of Political Affairs, declared:

"...the main issue in Puerto Rico is nationhood and... all facts, events, solutions, programs must stem from this position that the people of Puerto Rico constitute a nation with certain inalienable economic, social, and political rights now trampled upon by North American imperialism." 99 (Underscored word is italicized in original - ed.)

Not only has the Communist Party platform consistently advocated full independence for Puerto Rico, but Communist policy has strongly condemned any compromise on this issue. For example, a proposal that Puerto Rico be incorporated into the United States as a new state was angrily denounced by Cesar Andreu, former chairman of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico, in 1951:

"The Yankee imperialists and their lackeys in Puerto Rico were boasting but a few short months ago that the problem of independence of Puerto Rico was no longer an issue. They said that the Puerto Rican people had forsaken the idea of independence and in its place desired the institution of the 'new state.' The theory of the 'new state'... is a part of bourgeois cosmopolitanism." 100*

Similarly, the recent adoption by Puerto Rico of its own constitution, widely hailed in both the United States and Puerto Rico as signifying the end of the island's colonial status and representing a major step towards full Puerto Rican independence, has been bitterly attacked by the Communists as an effort to divert the Puerto Rican people from their goal of unconditional independence and to disguise continued oppression by Wall Street imperialists. Writing in the April, 1951, issue of Political Affairs, Theodore R. Bassett voiced the Party's opposition to the Puerto Rican constitution:

"The proposed constitution... would sanctify the colonial status of Puerto Rico by the seeming consent of the Puerto Rican people....

* "Bourgeois cosmopolitanism" in Communist parlance signifies a reactionary type of capitalist internationalism.

". . . the Communist Party of the United States (has) correctly characterized the proposed constitution as a fake, as a brazen and ill-disguised attempt to perpetuate and intensify the barbarous, national and social oppression of the Puerto Rican people. . . .

". . . the projected constitution for Puerto Rico could in no way benefit the Puerto Rican people and would only serve to screen its subjugation by Wall Street. . . .

"The fight to defeat the colonial constitution is the paramount question confronting the Puerto Rican liberation movement at this time." 101

Earlier, in February, 1951, Cesar Andreu, speaking for the Communist Party of Puerto Rico, had also registered a strenuous protest against the new constitution:

"The so-called Constitution. . . does not alter one bit the foundations of the colonial status of Puerto Rico. This so-called Constitution will be written in Washington. It will have limitations imposed by Washington. . . .

"The so-called Constitution is, therefore, an ill-disguised maneuver aimed at containing the independence struggle of the people, as well as silencing the rising support in Latin America and throughout the world for the national independence of Puerto Rico. It represents another example of the tactics of imperialism to try to check the liberation movements of the oppressed peoples. . . .

"The main task before the Communist Party of Puerto Rico is to guide the working class to assume its historical role as the leader of the people for independence and for the defeat of imperialist oppression. Within that main task we face as an immediate task. . . the organization of a mass campaign to defeat the plans of the government to impose the fake Constitution upon our people. . . ." 102

To summarize briefly, Communist Party strategy in Puerto Rico has been to identify Communist policies and objectives completely with national independence, with little or no reference to the ultimate and real aim of the Communist movement, namely, the overthrow of the feudal and capitalist system and the establishment of a socialist state which would speedily ally itself with the world Communist movement (i. e., the Soviet Union).

A review of Communist literature concerning Puerto Rico fails to reveal any allusions to the independence struggle as only "the first phase" of the socialist revolution and there are few references to the "revolutionary aspects" of the liberation movement. As we have seen, Cesar Andreu, former Puerto Rican Communist Party Chairman, described the "main task" of the Party in 1951 as the attainment of national independence and the "defeat of imperialist oppression." 103 And in 1938, V. J. Jerome declared that the "main issue" in Puerto Rico was nationhood. 104 This is not to say that there are no references to the socialist revolution in Communist propaganda relating to Puerto Rico, for there are occasional remarks to the effect that complete freedom for Puerto Rico can only be realized under a socialist system. However, for the most part, national independence is pictured as a goal in itself, and the overthrow of capitalism is mentioned only in veiled and secondary terms.

The reason for this de-emphasis on the question of a full-scale proletarian revolution can be found by referring back to the first section of this paper dealing with basic Communist theory. As previously noted

(see pages 15-19), the Communists conceive of each national liberation movement as having a twofold purpose: (1) national independence, and (2) the establishment of socialism. The extent to which they emphasize the latter goal depends in any given case upon two practical considerations: (1) the over-all strategy of World Communism at that time, and (2) the realistic chances for the success of a full-fledged proletarian revolution.

In the case of the Puerto Rican liberation movement, these considerations call for the Communists to tone down the "revolutionary aspects" of the situation. The reason, obviously, is that an all-out workers' revolution would have virtually no chance of succeeding in Puerto Rico at this time. For one thing, being essentially an agricultural country, the island has only a small and poorly organized working class (or "proletariat") to carry out such a revolution. And secondly, the Communist Party itself has made only minor headway in Puerto Rico to date and has no substantial influence in Puerto Rican affairs. As evidence of the failure of the Communist Party to appeal to Puerto Ricans, we are able to cite no less an authority than William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, USA. According to Foster, the membership of the Communist Party of Puerto Rico numbered only 1,200 as of 1947, out of a population of more than two million.¹⁰⁵ Actually, the membership of the Party is probably a great deal less. According to a reliable source, Communist Party membership in Puerto Rico in 1952 numbered only about 60 persons.¹⁰⁶

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA CONCERNING THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Communist Party attacks on United States "colonialism" in Puerto Rico have been inspired in large measure by the desire to discredit this country in the eyes of the other colonial and semicolonial peoples of South and Central America and the Caribbean area.

In like manner, Communist propaganda with respect to the Philippine Islands is aimed at arousing suspicion and hostility towards the United States among the various nations of the Far East and the Pacific area. For this reason, Communist propagandists picture United States interest in the Philippines as merely a "preliminary" step in an ominous plan to make the entire Pacific Ocean an "American lake" and the whole continent of Asia an "outright colony of Wall Street." This familiar Communist claim is illustrated in the following statements:

"As in the bloody adventure of 1898 when the Philippines were seized as a 'stepping-stone' to China, American imperialism is gearing the islands as a key base for aggression against China and Southeast Asia in a third world war." ¹⁰⁷

". . . Asiatic empire, not mere possession of the Philippines themselves, was the true objective of the program" (of American annexation of the Philippines - ed.) ¹⁰⁸

". . . the Philippines are to be turned into a base for struggle for the Dutch East Indies and hegemony in the Pacific." ¹⁰⁹

Communist propaganda also seeks to arouse a hatred for the United States among the Filipino people themselves. For the most part, this takes the form of

violent criticism of American policies in the Islands as well as alleged "exposures" of economic, social and political injustices suffered by the Filipino people as a result of American influence. The Communist Party line holds United States "imperialism" responsible for virtually every problem faced by the Philippines: low wages and poor living conditions, inadequate housing, illiteracy, malnutrition and disease, and even the slow development of Filipino industry and science.

As in the case of Puerto Rico, Communist propaganda of this type conspicuously ignores the fact that all of these economic and social problems afflicted the Philippines long before the United States had any influence at all in the Islands' affairs. Also, the Communists make no effort to compare living standards in the Philippines today with what they were in 1898 when the United States first acquired possession of the Islands.

Although pretending to be wholly objective and to be based entirely on concrete economic facts, Communist literature in this field frequently resorts to a psychological appeal to Filipino national pride. This is achieved by such devices as the following: American officials and businessmen in the Philippines are portrayed as being contemptuous of Filipino customs and culture; the Filipino people are "consoled" on the "national humiliation" they suffer as a result of American influence in the Islands; and it is suggested that the Filipino people can have no "national self-respect" so long as American interests

predominate in the Islands' affairs. The following excerpts from a recent Communist article relating to the Philippines offer good examples of this effort to play on Filipino nationalism:

"The Filipino moves about in an American-made world. The clothes he wears, the cigarettes he smokes, the canned food he eats, the music he hears, the news of the world he reads...are all American, although his own country has the ability to produce all of these things... The very home he lives in... is American-made; the corrugated iron roof, the nails in the walls, the electric light bulbs, the electric wiring, the electric switch, the kitchen utensils, the plates and spoons, his toothbrush, the bed clothes, the ring with which he weds his wife... 110

"The Filipino people have had to drain to the bottom the bitter dregs of national humiliation in being forced by their own oppressor (the United States - ed.) to send Filipino soldiers to their death in a vain effort to re-enslave the Korean people. The American headquarters did not even deign to permit the Filipino unit to retain its own Filipino commander." 111

Although, consistently critical of United States policies in the Philippines, Communist propaganda has been highly contradictory on the subject of Filipino independence. During the past twenty years, for example, the Communist platform has ranged from an unqualified demand for immediate and unconditional freedom from every trace of American influence to a program of moderation and gradual independence. Similarly, Communist propaganda has alternately urged a solution of the Islands' problems by violent revolution and, again, by a process of peaceful reform and evolution. These otherwise baffling shifts in Communist tactics can be understood, of course, only through a study

of corresponding changes in the strategy of the Soviet Union during the same period.

For example, during the spring of 1935, the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands issued a "Manifesto" which frankly avowed the Party's goal as the violent overthrow of the existing Filipino social system and the establishment of a Soviet state patterned along the lines of the U.S.S.R. The "Manifesto" declared that Filipino independence was only a secondary aim, and that national independence, in fact, could only be realized as a product of all-out proletarian revolution. Indeed, the "Manifesto" went so far as to characterize the Filipino national liberation movement (which was then dominated by non-Communist elements) as a "bourgeois national-reformist hoax" which was aimed at perpetuating imperialism in the Islands.

The "Manifesto" took particular pains to denounce the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act which had recently been adopted by the United States Congress. This measure, providing immediate commonwealth status for the Philippines and guaranteeing complete independence for the Islands by 1947, had been welcomed enthusiastically by nearly all Filipinos. However, the Communist "Manifesto" of 1935 bitterly condemned the bill as a "reformist parliamentary" approach to the question of independence which would only

"disrupt and retard the advance of the national-revolutionary movement."*

Having in this manner dismissed national independence as the primary objective, the "Manifesto" candidly set its sights on nothing less than a violent workers' revolution. All suggestions of moderation or gradual reform were rejected. As a matter of fact, it appeared to regard violence as a prerequisite for success:

"There is no salvation for us, our children, our country, except by revolutionary struggle. National freedom, land and a Workers' and Peasants' Republic have to be fought for and won. For under imperialism, the basic problems of the toilers are decided by force and by revolutionary mass force alone..."

"The issue is clear. Only the toilers themselves can save themselves and our country. All of us must realize that our problems, the problems of the toilers, the problems of food, land, national independence, and workers' and peasants' power, can only be finally solved by a great armed uprising of the people, led by the most revolutionary class, the working class, in close alliance with the exploited peasantry - an alliance headed by the revolutionary proletarian party, the Communist Party. Our problems can only be finally solved by the violent overthrow of the rule of American imperialism and the Philippine exploiters, by the revolutionary establishment of an Independent Workers' and Peasants' Government of the Philippines..."

* The use of the hybrid term "national-revolutionary" is significant, for it clearly betrays the fact that the Communists are concerned with Filipino independence only in so far as such independence is "revolutionary" i.e., only to the extent that it is beneficial to World Communism. The phrase "national-revolutionary," it might be added, is a favorite Communist cliche applied to colonial liberation movements during militant stages of Soviet policy. During nonmilitant or "evolutionary" periods in Soviet strategy, colonial movements are not described as "revolutionary" but rather as "patriotic," "progressive" or "anti-fascist."

"The issue is clear. Just as national independence will never be 'granted' by American imperialism, so national independence will never be secured as a result of peaceful 'constitutional' methods, as a result of national reformist leadership and policy." 112

As might be expected, the "Manifesto" was also careful to stress the need for an immediate alliance between the Filipino peoples and the Soviet Union as well as with the world-wide Communist movement. Without such an alliance, the "Manifesto" warned, the national liberation movement in the Philippines would somehow degenerate into "Filipino chauvinism":

"Either the policy of Filipino bourgeois national chauvinism, of national hatred and prejudices, of dividing the Filipino workers and peasants from the Moro, Chinese, etc., toilers, of attempting to isolate the Filipino masses from the international revolutionary movement....

"Or the Communist policy of proletarian internationalism, of the revolutionary unity of all workers, peasants and toilers in the Philippines in joint struggles in defense of our common interests; of the establishment of a revolutionary alliance of the masses of the Philippines with the international proletariat and colonial peoples, particularly with workers and peasants of the U.S.S.R.... Proletarian internationalism--this is vital for the revolution, for the victorious solution of our problems." 113

The Communist Party line of this period (prior to the adoption of "united front" tactics in 1936) also sought to undermine the prevalent belief that the Philippines were in need of United States protection against Japan. Communist writers dismissed this popular argument as "imperialist propaganda" invented by Wall Street in order to justify its continued exploitation of the

Philippines:

"Ironically enough, Wall Street has been able to win 'liberal' advocates for retrenchment of the Philippines. These people argue that, to avoid a dangerous game of experimental independence by means of which the Philippines may be lost, the United States must retrace its steps (i. e., cancel plans for eventual Philippine independence - ed.)..."

"The Scripps-Howard press has begun a lively campaign for retention of the Philippines, chauvinistically exploiting the growing distrust of Japanese imperialist intentions in the Far East. . . On the basis of struggling for peace and preserving 'peace and order in the Far East', it becomes the chief propagandist for imperialist retention of the Philippines on the ground of the lesser colonial evil: better a Wall Street pawn than a victim of Japanese imperialism." 114

The "Manifesto" of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands was issued in April, 1935, during the last few months of a distinctly aggressive phase of Soviet foreign policy. This militant stage of Soviet tactics began about 1928 and it had been marked generally by a hostile, uncompromising and expansionist attitude on the part of the Soviet Union and International Communism towards the entire non-Communist world.

However, between 1935 and 1938, the propaganda line of the Filipino Communist movement underwent a remarkable transformation! During August, 1938, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands convened in what was described as an "Extraordinary Plenary Session."

After meeting for three days, the Central Committee approved a "draft statement" setting forth in detail the Party's analysis of Filipino affairs as well as its recommendations for future Communist strategy. Taken alone, this document might be said to offer a reasonably accurate picture of conditions in the Philippines at that time as well as a fairly sound program for the future. But, if anyone were inclined to regard this document as a sincere and representative statement of Communist views, they had only to compare the "draft statement" with the 1935 "Manifesto" issued by the same Party only three years before and with which the "draft statement" was in almost complete disagreement! Even the sketchiest comparison of these two documents clearly reflects the hopeless inconsistency (or more exactly, the hypocrisy) of Communist propaganda in the colonial field.

In 1935, as we have seen, the Communists had denounced as "imperialist propaganda" the idea that the Philippines required United States protection against Japan. The 1938 "draft statement," by contrast, is largely premised on this very idea! Copying a page right out of the "imperialist" arguments of 1935, the draft statement declared:

"We would condemn ourselves in advance to national suicide if we blinded ourselves to the fact that we lie in the direct path of the Japanese war of conquest... The Filipino people must chart such a course as will safeguard them against aggression by Japan... Immediate severance of all relations with the United States would mean cutting ourselves loose from one of the most democratic powers in the Pacific, and would be a fatal blow to our independence... The interests of the Filipino

people lie in establishing their unity with the democratic and progressive forces in the United States...and not in an attitude which would...place the Philippines under the heel of the Mikado." 115

The 1935 "Manifesto" had demanded immediate, unconditional independence for the Philippines and the "violent overthrow of the rule of American imperialism." The 1938 draft statement, by comparison, bitterly condemned advocates of national independence as "unprincipled" individuals who, in all probability, were "agents of a foreign power." Even the idea of national independence, according to the 1938 statement, was "dangerous propaganda." As though attempting to justify this startling change from policies supported by the Communists themselves only three years earlier, the draft statement explained weakly:

"The right to separate from the United States does not place upon us the obligation to separate...Under present circumstances, separation does not assure the best means towards the attainment of fuller democracy for the people and complete independence." 116 (under-scored words are italicized in original text. - ed.)

As we have previously noted, the 1935 "Manifesto" of the Party was unreservedly opposed to the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act providing a commonwealth status for the Philippines. Among other epithets hurled at the Tydings-McDuffie bill, the "Manifesto" had described the measure as: a "bourgeois national reformist swindle," an "imperialist deception," a "fake," a "sham independence bill," a "national-reformist hoax," and an "imperialist lie."

The 1938 draft statement, by contrast, had nothing but praise for the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act, which it characterized as the mark of a "progressive" American government:

"The well-being of our people, the preservation and extension of our democratic rights and the advancement of the cause of complete independence can best be obtained, under the present circumstances, within the form of relationship established under the Independence Act..."

"The Communist Party of the Philippines hold inalienable the right of the Filipino people to self-determination, the right to independence. This right has been recognized in the Independence Act, in which a progressive American government has guaranteed it." 117

As though to add a final touch to the complete scuttling of the program advanced by the 1935 "Manifesto," the draft statement of 1938 went so far as to assert that a socialist revolution was neither possible nor desirable in the Philippines at that time. The statement even hinted that the local Communist Party had abandoned its revolutionary goals and that henceforward the Communist movement would gladly cooperate with all democratic elements in the Islands:

"We recognize that our country has not yet reached the level of development where establishment of socialism is immediately possible and that this goal is not acceptable as yet to the majority of our people... we recognize that the chief concern of our country now is to improve conditions of work and life, to defend and extend democratic liberties, to preserve our country from the ravages of intervention and war. The Communist Party, therefore, is ready to do all in its power to obtain these immediate objectives.... We are ready

to cooperate with all parties, political groups, labor, peasant and fraternal organizations, no matter what our difference may be with regard to ultimate aims and program, for the purpose of establishing a democratic front of the Filipino people..."¹¹⁸

As evidence of the Communists' newly adopted spirit of cooperation, the 1938 draft statement even made friendly overtures in the direction of Filipino President Manuel Quezon - the same Quezon who had been blasted by the Communists only three years before as a "leader of national betrayal and counter-revolution," a "treacherous enemy of the people" and "faithful lackey of American imperialism," a "traitor" to the cause of Filipino independence.¹¹⁹ The 1938 draft statement, on the other hand, pledged the Communists' "consistent cooperation" to Quezon along with a magnanimous offer to "drop all differences of the past":

"We offer President Quezon the consistent cooperation of our Party to organize mass support for, and to realize legislation of a progressive and democratic character, and to carry on further along the path of democracy. We stand ready to drop all differences of the past in the face of the present national emergency in order to make possible the democratic unity of the people."¹²⁰

This otherwise baffling change of Communist Party policy between 1935 and 1938 can be understood only in the perspective of over-all Soviet strategy during the same period. The complete about-face of the Filipino Communist Party on virtually every phase of its 1935 program represents, in fact, only a miniature version of a corresponding reversal in the tactics of the Soviet Union between 1935 and 1938, i.e., a shift from the offensive to the

defensive.

The reason for this major turn in Soviet strategy was the sudden threat offered to the U.S.S.R. by the rapid expansion of fascism both in Europe and Asia during the early 1930's. This development was especially ominous for the Soviet Union in view of the violent anti-Communist disposition of the leading fascist states, climaxed by the signing of a three-power "anti-Comintern Pact" between Germany, Italy and Japan in late 1936.

In these circumstances, the U.S.S.R. quickly dropped its former hostile attitude towards the entire capitalist world and strove frantically to create a common anti-fascist front with all non-fascist powers, notably the United States, England and France. The new strategy, popularly dubbed the "united front," called for the Soviet Union, as well as its various satellite Communist Parties throughout the world, to adopt a friendly pose towards the Western democracies. Revolutionary slogans and violent denunciations of capitalist "imperialism" were replaced almost overnight by the call for "unity" and by warm praise for the "progressive" institutions of the Western democracies.

The draft statement issued by the Communist Party of the Philippines in 1938 is typical of the conciliatory propaganda produced by the Communist movement during this "united front" period. As far as representing actual Communist principles concerning the Philippines goes, however, it is sheer fiction -

a fact which becomes clear by comparing the draft statement to the earlier or more recent propaganda line of the Party.

This "united front" strategy lasted until August, 1939, when this Communist maneuver was suddenly jolted by the signing of a nonaggression treaty between the Soviet Union and Germany and by the outbreak of a world war which did not immediately involve the U.S.S.R. At once, Communist propaganda dropped its feigned admiration for the Western democracies and resumed its violent attacks against United States "imperialism." World War II was characterized by Communist writers as an imperialist struggle heralding the final breakdown of world capitalism. As in 1935, the Philippines were again described as a victim of Wall Street exploitation. Once more, the demand for unconditional Filipino independence was dusted off and made a principal plank of the Communist platform.

This "re-evaluation" of the situation in the Philippines was summarized in a "Resolution on Latin America and the Philippines" adopted by the Eleventh National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A. in June, 1940. The resolution read, in part, as follows:

"...North American imperialism seeks to utilize the peoples of the Latin American republics and the Philippines in its own plans for participation in the frightful massacre... Wall Street pursues its predatory policies in various forms... The Philippines are to be turned into a base for struggle for the Dutch East Indies and hegemony in the Pacific... The Convention sends its warm fraternal

greetings to our brother Communist Parties south of the Rio Grande and in the Philippines which are displaying great heroism in the task of rallying the people to the anti-imperialist struggle. In solidarity with the peoples of Puerto Rico and the Philippines, our Party supports their demand for national independence from the yoke of American imperialism." 121

This new phase of Communist propaganda was comparatively short-lived. It endured only until June 22, 1941, when the Nazi invasion of Russia exploded the strange alliance between Hitler and Stalin and suddenly converted the erstwhile "imperialist" war into a holy "anti-fascist" crusade. As might be expected, the Communist Party line with respect to the Philippines promptly reverted to its "evolutionary" approach. The United States was again pictured as a kindly benefactor of the Filipino peoples. The demand for unconditional Filipino independence was abruptly discarded and replaced with the theme of "unity."

As a matter of fact, following the Japanese invasion of the Philippines in December, 1941, the Filipino Communist Party took a leading part in the formation of a powerful resistance movement which, during the succeeding four years, was to prove a constant thorn in the side of Japanese occupation forces. The Filipino resistance movement, popularly known as the Hukbalahap or simply as "Huks," is credited with killing some 20,000 Japanese troops in the course of more than a thousand skirmishes and raids. Moreover, the Hukbalahap furnished valuable intelligence information to the United States Army

prior to the American counterinvasion of the Philippines in 1945. The Philippines were liberated by American troops in March, 1945, and in August, 1945, the Japanese capitulated to the Allies thus bringing World War II to an end.

During the seven years which have elapsed since these dramatic events, Communist propaganda concerning the Philippines has -- like over-all Soviet policy -- again assumed a belligerent attitude towards the United States and towards the capitalist world in general.

During 1946, in accordance with the provisions of the Tydings-McDuffie Independence Act of 1935, the Philippines were granted full national independence. Despite this evidence of good faith on the part of the United States and despite the fact that it is no longer reasonable to describe the Philippines as a colonial area, the Communist line has continued to denounce American "imperialism" in the Islands and to cite the Philippines as an example of U.S. "colonialism."

Ignoring all proof to the contrary, Communist propagandists insist that the independence now enjoyed by the Philippines is only a "sham" which conceals an even greater degree of American exploitation.

"For the American imperialists the liberation of the Philippines meant simply the restoration of American colonial control... American imperialism set as its immediate aims the re-establishment of the power of the feudal landlords and the crushing of the Huk forces

and the peasant, and especially the labor movement, the main revolutionary force...

"A few trial balloons in 1945...urging postponement of independence, burst under a barrage of hostile comment. American policy then definitely committed itself to granting formal independence, while using it as a screen behind which to impose greater economic, military and political control..."¹²²

The Communists claim, in fact, that American control of the Philippines is actually enhanced by Filipino independence. This argument is justified by the following curious reasoning:

"...In effect this(American grant of independence to the Philippines - ed.) represented a 'cunning counter-offensive' of the imperialists, much the same as the Communist Party of India has described the formal grant of independence to India. Independence was to provide greater formal control to the Filipinos and greater real control for Americans. Divested of the formal responsibility for rule, retained American power, operating through puppets, would be all the greater."¹²³ (underscored words italicized in original text - ed.)

One of the surest ways to start an argument with the Communists in recent years has been to merely suggest that the granting of independence to the Philippines in 1946 is proof of the benevolent motives of the United States in the colonial field.

Earl Browder, former Communist Party leader in the United States, recently published a book ("War or Peace with Russia") in which he advanced this idea. The book was promptly denounced by Communist writers. Singled out for special abuse was Browder's claim that the new Filipino

independence was part of a "progressive" American colonial policy.

Writing in the June, 1947, issue of Political Affairs, Alexander Bittelman blasted Browder's proposals:

"Perhaps the most outrageous part of the book... is its 'original' theory of the anti-colonialism of the United States..."

"This is a most amazing performance, which develops to the full all the absurdities, unrealities, and brazen revisionist opportunism of Browderism. At this time American imperialism is engaged in a full-fledged drive for world domination; employing for the purpose atom-bomb intimidation; using food as a means of securing economic penetration and political influence; supporting every reactionary and fascist force to secure positions... for imperialist rule and exploitation... At this time... American imperialism is working hand in glove, in an alliance, with the most sinister forces of world reaction... At this precise time, then, Earl Browder, still claiming to be a Marxist, has the audacity and shamelessness to tell the people that American imperialism is following a progressive policy of 'anti-colonialism'.

". . . According to Browder, the Philippines are no longer a colony because an act of formal independence has been enacted by the United States Congress. But what is the actual situation? Under the cover of formal independence, the Philippines are today more oppressed by American imperialism than before. They are robbed and exploited by Wall Street monopolies with the assistance of the most reactionary and fascist and corrupt landlord capitalist forces of the Philippine Islands..."¹²⁴

Six years have now passed since the formal ratification of Filipino independence. During this period the Communists have continued to insist that the fledgling government of the Philippines represents nothing more than a "lackey" of American imperialism, a "betrayal" of the real interests of the Filipino peoples. But despite the disruptive and obstructionist tactics employed by the Communists, the Philippines have made steady progress towards full self-government.

Anyone familiar with the shifting course of Marxist propaganda during the past twenty years will agree that it would be foolish to try to predict what future tactics the Communists may adopt in the Philippines. But one fact is clear: namely, that Communist strategy in the Philippines will continue, as it has in the past, to be merely an adjunct of the over-all strategy of the Soviet Union and world Communism, rather than an honest expression of the needs and desires of the Filipino peoples themselves.

CONCLUSIONS

The chief conclusion to be drawn from this study is that Communist tactics concerning national liberation and colonial movements are not related to the actual needs and aspirations of the dependent nations and colonies, but are based instead only on the self-interests of the Communists themselves - to be more precise, on the self-interests of the Soviet Union. Such "principles" as the Communists have advanced with respect to dependent nations and colonies have, in actual practice, been rapidly discarded whenever they opposed the practical aims of the U. S. S. R.

The fraudulent character of Communist theory in this field is clearly shown, for instance, in a review of changing Communist attitudes toward the concept of self-determination of nations. The principle of self-determination, as we have seen, has been described by the Communists at one time as "an inalienable right of nations" and, in almost the next breath, as an "imperialist slogan"; at one moment it has been called an "essential element in the solution of the national question," and the very next it has been dismissed as a "scholastic question." In each case, of course, the favor or scorn with which self-determination was regarded was not based in any way upon ethical considerations but only on the naked self-interest of the Soviet dictatorship.

It follows from this that Communist policy with respect to any particular colonial movement can only be understood in the light of the over-all strategy of the Soviet Union.

The contradictory course of Communist propaganda with respect to the Philippine Islands, for instance, defies any reasonable explanation so long as the student tries to relate such propaganda primarily to conditions in the Philippine Islands themselves. But as soon as the Communist propaganda line is examined against the background of changing Soviet policies, the mystery dissolves; for it is discovered that Communist tactics in the Philippines at any given time are nothing more than a small-scale version of world-wide Soviet tactics during the same period.

It is also apparent that, although the Communists have no real interest in colonial liberation or national independence as such, they nevertheless consider the colonial and national minority problem one of the major potential weaknesses of the capitalist system. By the same token, the Communists believe that the colonial and dependent nations of the world are among the strongest potential allies of their revolutionary cause.

This explains the Communists' constant effort to convince the colonial peoples of the world that they have a mutual interest, with Communism, in the violent overthrow of the capitalist system. It explains the Communists' constant attempt to persuade colonial peoples that only through the downfall of

[REDACTED] CONFIDENTIAL

capitalist society will all of their problems be solved.

In the two specific colonial areas which we have considered - namely, Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands - Communist propaganda has had little real success thus far. To date, the Communists have been unable to divert the national liberation movements of either of these nations into a pro-Communist or pro-Soviet direction. Both Puerto Rico and the Philippines continue to move steadily forward towards full self-government and independence, in both cases without any great degree of Communist control.

However, it would be foolish to believe that the Communists will not continue, or even intensify, their efforts to exploit the colonies and dependent nations of the world in the interests of Soviet dictatorship.

One of the primary aims of this paper has been to point out the many fallacies and inconsistencies of Communist theory and practice regarding national liberation and colonial movements. It is hoped that the reader will, as a result, be better able both to recognize Communist propaganda in this field and to effectively counter it whenever the occasion should arise.

THE END

25X1

- 81 -

[REDACTED] CONFIDENTIAL

SOURCES

1. Joseph Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, p. 8.
(New York: International Publishers, 1934).
2. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, The Communist Manifesto, p. 11.
(New York: International Publishers, 1932; eleventh printing, 1939).
3. Joseph Stalin, The National Question and Leninism, p. 11.
(Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1950).
4. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, op. cit., p. 13.
5. Joseph Stalin, op. cit., p. 13
6. Ibid., p. 17.
7. Ibid., p. 19.
8. Ibid., p. 62.
9. Ibid., p. 91.
10. Ibid., p. 91.
11. Marx and Engels, op. cit., p. 28.
12. Joseph Stalin, op. cit., p. 19.
13. Marx and Engels, op. cit., p. 28.
14. Ibid., p. 28.
15. Ibid., p. 20.
16. V. I Lenin, Selected Works, Vol. XI, p. 35.
(New York: International Publishers, 1943).
17. Joseph Stalin, op. cit., p. 17.
18. Ibid., p. 15.

19. Ibid., pp. 74-75.
20. Ibid., p. 76.
21. Ibid., p. 114.
22. Ibid., p. 89.
23. Ibid., pp. 89-90.
24. Ibid., p. 90.
25. Ibid., p. 90.
26. Ibid., p. 91.
27. Ibid., p. 16
28. William Z. Foster, Outline Political History of the Americas, pp. 316-320. (New York: International Publishers, 1951).
29. Georgi Dimitroff, The United Front: The Struggle Against Fascism and War, p. 79. (New York: International Publishers, 1938).
30. Joseph Stalin, op. cit., pp. 147-148.
31. Ibid., p. 195.
32. Ibid., p. 115.
33. Ibid., p. 193.
34. Joseph Stalin, "The International Character of the October Revolution," Problems of Leninism, p. 202. (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1947).
35. Ibid., p. 200.
36. Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, pp. 194-195.
37. Ibid., p. 18.
38. Ibid., p. 20.

39. Ibid., p. 56.
40. Ibid., p. 19.
41. Ibid., p. 68.
42. Ibid., p. 69.
43. Ibid., p. 70.
44. Ibid., pp. 73-74.
45. Ibid., p. 75.
46. Ibid., p. 106.
47. Ibid., p. 110.
48. Ibid., pp. 112-113
49. Ibid., p. 79.
50. Ibid., p. 79.
51. Ibid., p. 64.
52. Ibid., p. 168.
53. Ibid., p. 169.
54. Ibid., p. 151.
55. Ibid., p. 106.
56. Ibid., p. 113.
57. Ibid., p. 152.
58. Joseph Stalin, Marxism and the National Question, p. 220.
(New York: International Publishers, 1942).

59. Stalin, Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, pp. 92-93.
60. Ibid., p. 92.
61. Ibid., p. 78.
62. Ibid., p. 79.
63. Ibid., p. 64.
64. N. Bucharin, Programme of the World Revolution, p. 4.
(Glasgow, Scotland: Socialist Labour Press, 1920).
65. William Z. Foster, "Specific Features of American Imperialist Expansion," Political Affairs, August, 1948, pp. 675-678.
66. William Z. Foster, Outline Political History of the Americas, p. 483.
(New York: International Publishers, 1951).
67. Alexander Bittelman, "Problems of Peace, Democracy, and National Independence," Political Affairs, June, 1947, p. 512.
68. Benjamin J. Davis, "On the Colonial Liberation Movements," Political Affairs, December, 1950, p. 42.
69. Benjamin J. Davis, "Foster's Contributions to the Cause of National and Colonial Liberation," Political Affairs, March, 1951, p. 39.
70. William Z. Foster, "Specific Features of American Imperialist Expansion," Political Affairs, August, 1948, p. 676.
71. Ibid.
72. "Review of the Month," The Communist, October, 1940, p. 881.
73. Lucille Perry, "The Coming Pan-American Conference at Montevideo," The Communist, November, 1933, p. 1113.
74. William Z. Foster, Outline Political History of the Americas, p. 254.
75. Lucille Perry, op. cit., p. 1108.

76. William Z. Foster, Outline Political History of the Americas, p. 258.
77. Ibid., p. 262.
78. Lucile Perry, op. cit., p. 1108.
79. B. T. Lo, "American Policy in the Far East and the Roosevelt Regime," The Communist, June, 1940, p. 554.
80. George Marion, Bases & Empire, p. 90. (Printed in U.S.A. by Prompt Press, for Fairplay Publishers, 25 West 44th Street, New York City).
81. William Z. Foster, Outline Political History of the Americas, p. 487.
82. Benjamin J. Davis, "On the Colonial Liberation Movements," Political Affairs, December, 1950, pp. 43-44.
83. A. Capek, "The United States in Asia," Political Affairs, October, 1951, p. 63.
84. Betty Gannett, "Wall Street's War Against the Korean People," Political Affairs, August, 1950, p. 7.
85. Ibid., p. 6.
86. Statement of the Secretariat of the National Committee, Communist Party, U.S.A., "Halt Wall Street Aggression in Asia!", Political Affairs, August, 1950, p. 1.
87. "The Communist Position on the Marshall Plan," Statement of the Communist Party, U.S.A., Political Affairs, April, 1948, p. 308.
88. M. Suslov, "Defense of Peace and the Struggle Against the War-Mongers," Political Affairs, January, 1950, p. 33.
89. Victor Perlo, American Imperialism, p. 57. (New York: International Publishers, 1951).
90. George Marion, op. cit., p. 167.
91. Ibid., p. 167.

92. William Z. Foster, "The Domination of the Capitalist World by the United States," Political Affairs, December, 1950, pp. 5-6.
93. William Z. Foster, "Specific Features of American Imperialist Expansion," Political Affairs, August, 1948, p. 677.
94. Ibid., p. 677
95. Alexander Bittelman, "The New State of Israel," Political Affairs, August, 1948, p. 720.
96. V. J. Jerome, "The Yugoslav Leaders on the Path of Betrayal," Political Affairs, August, 1948, p. 705.
97. William Z. Foster, Outline Political History of the Americas, p. 231.
98. Cesar Andreu, "The Rising Tide of Struggle in Puerto Rico," Political Affairs, February, 1951, p. 223.
99. V. J. Jerome, "Marxism-Leninism for Society and Science," The Communist, January, 1938, p. 77.
100. Cesar Andreu, op. cit., p. 221.
101. Theodore R. Bassett, "Washington's 'Constitution' for Puerto Rico," Political Affairs, April, 1951, pp. 65-73.
102. Cesar Andreu, op. cit., pp. 221, 225.
103. Ibid., p. 225.
104. V. J. Jerome, "Marxism-Leninism for Society and Science," The Communist, January, 1938, p. 77.
105. William Z. Foster, Outline Political History of the Americas, p. 386.
106. A confidential source.
107. Henry Newman, "The Stake of the American People in Philippine Independence," Political Affairs, May, 1951, p. 54.
108. George Marion, op. cit., p. 84.

109. "Resolution on Latin America and the Philippines," adopted by Eleventh National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., May 30-June 2, 1940, The Communist, July, 1940, p. 621.
110. Henry Newman, op. cit., p. 59.
111. Ibid., p. 66.
112. "Manifesto," Communist Party of the Philippine Islands, The Communist, April, 1935, pp. 372, 374.
113. Ibid., pp. 378-379.
114. Harry Gannes, "Wall Street Faces the Far East," The Communist, January, 1936, pp. 43-44.
115. "The Philippines Mobilize Against Japanese Aggression," draft statement approved by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands, August 26-28, 1938, The Communist, December, 1938, pp. 1112-1124.
116. Ibid., p. 1123.
117. Ibid., pp. 1123-1124.
118. Ibid., p. 1130.
119. "Manifesto," Communist Party of the Philippine Islands, The Communist, April, 1935, pp. 366-380.
120. "The Philippines Mobilize Against Japanese Aggression," draft statement approved by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Philippine Islands, August 26-28, 1938, The Communist, December, 1938, p. 1130.
121. "Resolution on Latin America and the Philippines," adopted by Eleventh National Convention of the Communist Party, U.S.A., May 30-June 2, 1940, The Communist, July, 1940, pp. 621-622.

122. Henry Newman, op. cit., p. 56.
123. Ibid., pp. 56-57.
124. Alexander Bittelman, "Problems of Peace, Democracy, and National Independence," Political Affairs, June, 1947, pp. 511-512.

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/01/12 : CIA-RDP65-00756R000300040001-4

CONFIDENTIAL

25X1

Approved For Release 2004/01/12 : CIA-RDP65-00756R000300040001-4

CONFIDENTIAL